

to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 684. An act for the relief of Ida M. Raney; without amendment (Rept. No. 1214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 779. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alan Sells and the estate of Alan Sells; without amendment (Rept. No. 1215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. S. 801. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanor M. Hannon; with amendments (Rept. No. 1216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 998. An act for the relief of Gregory Stelmak; without amendment (Rept. No. 1217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1017. An act for the relief of Charlie B. Rouse and Mrs. Louette Rouse; without amendment (Rept. No. 1218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 247. A bill for the relief of E. D. Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 1219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1250. A bill for the relief of Roy S. Councilman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEDRICK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1464. A bill for the relief of Leonard Hutchings; with amendments (Rept. No. 1221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1796. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Carolyn Lamb; with amendments (Rept. No. 1222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1836. A bill for the relief of Viola Theriaque; with amendment (Rept. No. 1223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1848. A bill for the relief of Max Hirsch; without amendment (Rept. No. 1224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1854. A bill for the relief of Thomas Sumner; with amendments (Rept. No. 1225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2087. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker; with amendment (Rept. No. 1226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2171. A bill for the relief of Solomon Schlierman; with amendments (Rept. No. 1227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2289. A bill for the relief of Arnold Mecham; with amendment (Rept. No. 1228). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2318. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mirtie Pike; with amendments (Rept. No. 1229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2393. A bill for the relief of Elsie Peter; with amendment (Rept. No. 1230).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2661. A bill for the relief of W. D. Jones and Ethel S. Jones; with amendment (Rept. No. 1231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2837. A bill for the relief of George Stiles; without amendment (Rept. No. 1232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2993. A bill for the relief of William Phillips; with amendment (Rept. No. 1233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3277. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders; with amendment (Rept. No. 1234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3514. A bill for the relief of Paul Stanik; with amendments (Rept. No. 1235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3904. A bill for the relief of Raymond C. Campbell; with amendment (Rept. No. 1236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4240. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Wilmot; with amendments (Rept. No. 1237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 382. Resolution requesting information from the Secretary of State with reference to Tyler Kent; without amendment (Rept. No. 1209). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4717. A bill to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4718. A bill to provide optional retirement for Government officers and employees who have rendered at least 25 years of service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 4719. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a building thereon for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 4720. A bill to amend the act of December 7, 1944, relating to certain overtime compensation of civilian employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota:

H. R. 4721. A bill to transfer certain real and personal property in Ward County, N. Dak., to the State of North Dakota acting by and through the Industrial Commission of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 4722. A bill to exempt from gross income for income-tax purposes certain earnings of honorably discharged veterans and his or her spouse and children under 18 years of age received since December 7, 1941, and re-

ceived during certain periods after discharge; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 4723. A bill for the relief of John M. Shipp; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4724. A bill for the relief of Edwin H. Sanford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. R. 4725. A bill for the relief of Alexander Michailovich Kalinin, Paul Loughbine, and Leon de Witt Ravadovsky; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4726. A bill for the relief of Frederick D. Ballou; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 4727. A bill for the relief of R. R. Whitener; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 4728. A bill for the relief of James Harold Pendley, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause I of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1329. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: A resolution of the Maine Woolen and Worsted Association adopted November 8 at their meeting held at the State House, Augusta, Maine, urging no action reducing present tariff schedules concerning the woolen and worsted industry until full opportunity is afforded all parties and this association in particular to be heard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1330. Also, petition of Adelbert A. Jameson and approximately 100 other citizens of Rockland, Maine, and vicinity, urging immediate action on H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1331. By Mr. TIBBOTT: Resolution of the Verhovay Fraternal Insurance Association, Johnstown, Pa., protesting against the expulsion of the Hungarian population from Czechoslovakia, by the provisional government of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1332. Also, a resolution of the Verhovay Fraternal Insurance Association, Scalp Level, Pa., protesting against the expulsion of the Hungarian population from Czechoslovakia, by the provisional government of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, Father Almighty, whose love will not let us go, outlasting all our stolid indifference, the resistless working of Thy eternal purpose beats ever against the stubborn self-willed barriers which we have set up. For this still moment may we hush all other sounds save the divine knocking and the entreating voice which says: "If any man will open the door, I

will come in." We know, O Spirit of Love and Purity, that when our heart's door swings on its hesitant hinges and Thou dost enter, those things which are unlovely and unclean cannot stay to embitter and pollute.

Come to us, we pray Thee, as refining fire to purge our inner lives from envy, hatred, prejudice, and malice. Suffer us not to let the sun go down upon our wrath. In a mad and violent day, may we walk and work in the peace that the world giveth not, in the charity that thinketh no evil, in the good will that bridges all chasms; and when the sunset comes, may we face its summons with an approving conscience void of offense toward Thee and our fellow man. We ask in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, November 16, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on November 17, 1945, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 562) for the relief of Klau-Van Pieterse-Dunlap Associates, Inc.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 102) authorizing the printing as a public document the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers Explanatory of the Federal Income-tax Law With Respect to Members of the Armed Forces of the United States in World War II," and providing for additional copies thereof, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 391. An act to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940:

H. R. 1591. An act to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy, and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, from among the sons of persons who have been or shall hereafter be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor:

H. R. 1869. An act authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2525. An act to include stepparents, parents by adoption, and any person who has stood in loco parentis among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on November 16, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 784) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John T. Webb, Sr.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the Senate Tuesday and Wednesday because of my absence from the city with the Senate's Special Atomic Bomb Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following-named Senators, who are members of the Atomic Energy Committee, may be absent for 2 days from sessions of the Senate, to proceed to Oak Ridge, Tenn., on an inspection trip: The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the sessions of the Senate on tomorrow, Tuesday, and on the following day, Wednesday, in order to attend meetings of the Atomic Bomb Committee which will be held outside Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent tomorrow and on the day following in order to attend a meeting of the Atomic Bomb Committee at Oak Ridge.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent on the same days in order to attend meetings of the Atomic Bomb Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

THE ITEM VETO—RESULTS OF GALLUP POLL

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a recent Gallup poll which shows very substantial approval throughout the country for the item veto, a proposal which I have repeatedly presented to the Senate and which is now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I should like to add that President Roosevelt in a letter to the Senate in his lifetime endorsed the item veto. I should like further to add that President Truman has endorsed it. I ask that the Gallup poll upon this subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GALLUP POLL

PRINCETON, N. J., November 15.—Americans ordinarily take a very cautious attitude

toward changing traditional procedures of government, but there is one reform proposed by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan, which appeals to a substantial majority of voters.

Senator VANDENBERG's proposal would authorize a President to veto specific items in appropriation bills.

At present, under the Constitution, the White House must approve or veto any bill as a whole. This makes congressional logrolling combinations possible and enables Members to get their pet schemes adopted by tacking them onto appropriation bills as riders, since the President cannot veto parts of a bill.

The Vandenberg proposal to change this system was put before a cross-section of the voters of the country in an institute poll as follows:

"At the present time when Congress passes a bill to spend money, the President cannot veto parts of that bill but must accept it in full or veto it. Do you think this should be changed so that the President can veto some items in a bill to spend money without vetoing the entire bill?"

The vote of the public follows:

	Percent
Yes.....	57
No.....	14
No opinion.....	29

The Vandenberg proposal, introduced in the Senate and now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee, was in the form of a resolution to submit to the States a constitutional amendment authorizing a President to veto parts of appropriation bills.

Many students of government have long felt that the system was in need of reform. The principle of the Vandenberg proposal has been in effect for some time in several State governments, including New York.

The idea is a nonpartisan one so far as voters themselves are concerned. Both Democrats and Republicans polled in the sample support the proposed reform by about the same majority.

Overwhelming approval is found among voters with opinions in every education group.

An analysis of attitudes by political party and by education follows:

	Yes	No	No opinion
By party:	Percent	Percent	Percent
Democrats.....	59	12	29
Republicans.....	56	20	24
By education:			
College.....	70	20	10
High school.....	65	17	18
Grade school or no school.....	49	12	39

INABILITY OF KELSEY-HAYES WHEEL CO. TO FURNISH TRUCK PARTS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask to read into the RECORD at this point a telegram which the Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Co. of Detroit sent to all its patrons:

NOVEMBER 15, 1945.

We regret to inform you that as of today we are discontinuing shipments of all original equipment truck parts. This decision is necessary due to the delay of the Government agency, the Automotive Branch, OPA, in acting on price relief or suspension for these parts. Until some action is taken by this agency by which we can recover in our selling prices the increased labor and material costs we have been compelled to add since March 1942, we will be unable to serve you.

KELSEY-HAYES WHEEL CO.

Mr. President, the message speaks for itself.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	Murdock
Ball	Hart	Myers
Barkley	Hatch	O'Daniel
Bilbo	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Reed
Buck	Hill	Revercomb
Bushfield	Hoey	Robertson
Butler	Huffman	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Carville	Knowland	Stewart
Chavez	La Follette	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Tunnell
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Wagner
Ferguson	Maybank	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	Wheeler
George	Millikin	White
Gerry	Mitchell	Wiley
Green	Moore	Wilson
Guffey	Morse	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is a delegate to the American Legion convention in Chicago, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are members of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LAWS PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a complete set of laws passed by the Municipal

Councils and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands during the fiscal year 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT RELATING TO COMPULSORY RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide eligibility for annuity at age 70 after at least 5 years of service in lieu of 15 years of such service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY—RESOLUTION OF WAKE FOREST (N. C.) COLLEGE

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the faculty of Wake Forest College, North Carolina, in regular session November 12, 1945, relating to the development and control of atomic energy.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE,
Wake Forest, N. C.

We, the faculty of Wake Forest College, aware of the tremendous import of atomic energy and atomic weapons to all mankind, believe that the security of the United States can be achieved only through international cooperation for the joint control of these new forces. We believe that a policy of secret research and exclusive national control can only result in a ruinous competitive armaments race in which all the nations of the world will join, leading to the danger of a new and catastrophic world war. From such a war no people will emerge free, if indeed they survive at all.

We therefore resolve and urge:

1. That the United States as the country that has opened the way for the development of atomic energy, should immediately invite the Governments of Great Britain and the Soviet Union to a conference to prevent competitive armaments and consider the problems arising from this overwhelming development.

2. That the United States champion the need for international development with the broadest utilization of all resources and the widest freedom of research and interchange of ideas.

We believe furthermore that any legislative effort which stifles free and open scientific investigation, which seeks to prevent public surveillance and criticism of the application of atomic energy will stifle scientific progress, undermine peace and is therefore harmful to the national interest.

We therefore urge Congress:

1. That legislative action for the control of atomic energy be preceded by full, free, and public discussion.

2. That the authority for the guidance of the development of atomic energy shall consist of men of scientific competence, fully compensated for their services and able to work toward the maximum utilization of atomic energy for the welfare of the public and not for the interests of any special group.

3. That the administrator chosen to direct the work of such an authority be a civilian.

4. That security regulations be limited to direct military application of atomic power and that free research and right of publication be immediately resumed in the field of atomic physics.

Passed by the faculty of Wake Forest College in regular session November 12, 1945.

E. B. EARNSHAW,
Secretary.

PEACETIME COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING—LETTER FROM ORMAL L. MILLER

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Rev. Ormal L. Miller, pastor of the First Methodist Church, of Topeka, Kans., expressing his opposition to peacetime compulsory military training. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter and that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
Topeka, Kans., November 8, 1945.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I want to register a very emphatic protest against the program for compulsory military training which is being proposed. In my judgment it is a serious mistake with far-reaching consequences for the future.

It should be very apparent to us by this time that military power is a very dangerous factor in the life of any nation. It does not provide security, as witness the plight first of France, and later of Germany. It inevitably creates tensions and suspicions which sooner or later result in trouble.

The military leaders of the Nation have demonstrated their ability to prosecute a successful war, but I refuse to grant them superior insight into the way to maintain peace. It is my belief that we will make a fatal mistake to permit them to influence the future course of the Nation. We have fought two tragic wars to rid the world of militarism, and now having decisively crushed militarism in Germany and Japan, it seems unbelievable that we will assume the same role which has brought them to disaster.

Reference has been made to our responsibility to the future youth of the Nation. It seems to me we have a very great responsibility to the youth of this generation, and of a generation ago, who have made a great sacrifice to rid the world of this curse. Our greatest contribution to future generations will not be military regimentation, but vigorous and sacrificial efforts to establish vital agencies of peace and international cooperation.

The training of large armies is not our problem. At the time of Pearl Harbor we had many men in training, but industry was not in production to supply them. I am convinced that any real emergency will be met adequately by civilian armies if need be, provided atomic power has not produced catastrophe first. We confront a new phase of international history, and it is fatal to attempt to carry out-moded methods into the future. Rather let us be adventurous in building understanding, brotherhood, and creative agencies of peaceful cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

ORMAL L. MILLER.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER—LETTER FROM CABINET OF WICHITA (KANS.) COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a letter from the cabinet of the Wichita (Kans.) Council of Churches relating to the United Nations Charter.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WICHITA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Wichita, Kans., November 14, 1945.

HON. CLYDE M. REED,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REED: The United Nations Charter has been ratified with unprecedented speed. The peoples of the earth are pinning high hopes on this important organization. If the United States and Russia and Great Britain will collaborate, UNO will wield an important force in world affairs, but, of these three, the moral leadership rests primarily with the United States.

In reality, if the United States takes the wise course, the other nations of the world will follow our leadership and UNO will succeed. If we follow the wrong course, it will fail. To make it succeed, the wisest step for the United States is to precede all decisions that have international implications by consultation with the other nations through UNO.

Such questions as universal military training, the control of atomic energy, the government of vanquished peoples, the disposal of colonies, the establishment of bases, and such, if decided by ourselves, in isolation, will provoke rivalry. But if we will discuss them with the United Nations before taking action, there will be a spirit of confidence and the foundation of peace.

We urge that you be alert to use the offices of the UNO in every proper international matter. We urge that you resist the passage of acts that have bearing on international relations prior to report of our UNO delegates as to the understandings they have been able to secure. If we can hold enactment of universal military training and similar matters in abeyance pending an attempted agreement among the nations, it may be possible to eliminate many costly policies.

Let us get away from bloc action as far as possible. Let us try the democratic way among the nations—full and free discussion, full publicity, full cooperation. This is the most hopeful course for the future.

Respectfully,

CABINET OF THE WICHITA
COUNCIL OF CHURCHES.

RALPH E. LIGHTNER, President.

JOHN W. MELOY, Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1152. A bill to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 750).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. 1289. A bill to amend section 1 of the Federal Power Act, with respect to the terms of office of members of the Federal Power Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 751).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 7. A bill to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure; with an amendment (Rept. No. 752).

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

H. R. 608. A bill to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 753).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1604. A bill for the relief of Leo Stuhr; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1605. A bill to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy and Marine Corps shore activities; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. WAGNER (for himself and Mr. Murray) introduced Senate bill 1606, to provide for a national health program, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BALL:

S. 1607. A bill to provide for the naturalization of Peter Kim; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

S. 1608. A bill for the relief of William A. Gallagher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1609. A bill for the relief of Catherin Gilbert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1610. A bill to provide for the rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSION ACT OF 1946—AMENDMENT

Mr. WALSH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 28, line 12, insert the following: "Provided further, That of the funds remaining available for advance base construction, material, and equipment, not to exceed \$6,000,000 shall be available toward reconstruction of the civilian economy of Guam."

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Ansgar Lutheran, of November 12, 1945, entitled "Universal Military Training," and a letter which I have received from a member of the armed forces at Camp Gordon, Ga., dated October 29, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

President Truman has spoken. He asks us to introduce universal military training. We must do the same as they have done in Europe in the past. But what has happened to the nations who had universal training? They are now prostrate in the dust. Germany, Japan, Italy, France. The nations, Great Britain, Russia, and the United States, that were not prepared for war, won the war.

Is that the way of the world? Does it mean that he who takes the sword shall perish by the sword? Jesus did say something about that, and He should be an authority worth listening to even in Washington. Oswald

Spengler pictured the nations with strong military regimes as nations that would finally be defeated. He did this in his book *The Decline of the West*. He was right.

What is it that makes a nation strong? Would it be out of the way to quote Psalm 20: 7-8? "Some trust in chariots and some in horses; but we will make mention of the name of Jehovah our God. They are bowed down and fallen; but we are risen and stand upright."

Whenever civilization gets to depend upon mechanical things alone, it is doomed.

Universal military training will change our whole national outlook. It will make us develop a military spirit. What effect will that have upon our national life? It will be the military men who will decide our policies. Have we not constantly condemned the military clique of Japan, and the military men of Prussia? Are we now to begin to develop that which we have just defeated and which we are just placing on trial both in Japan and Germany?

Let us give peace a chance. The common man is sick of war. He was made to sacrifice for war, he will gladly sacrifice for peace, but he must be shown the way.

What do our leaders think universal training can do for us? It certainly cannot prepare our souls for national emergencies. It never could. History proves the very opposite.

And the atomic bomb. An atomic bomb may be planted secretly in 50 of our big cities and let off as a time bomb, so these cities will be wiped out in 12 hours. History teaches us that spiritually decadent people always lose. No spiritually weak people can win no matter what weapon they get. Germany proved that. She lost because she had lost her soul. Only the strong Christian can survive.

We know that the advocates of the universal training will say, keep your powder dry. But no powder is ever dry if Christianity is forgotten.

Sometimes we have thought all men sent to Congress should first have a heavy course in history and Christianity before they are sworn into office. We must get to see that the things men live by are not the mechanical things, it is the things of God.

CAMP GORDON, GA., October 29, 1945.

HON. HUGH BUTLER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the present time when questions of the utmost importance in regard to the future welfare of the United States are being debated and a decision must be made I feel it is the duty of every citizen to make known his ideas to the elected legislators of the country.

I am deeply concerned about the peacetime military training program. My 2 years' service in the Army have convinced me that 1 year of military training will not materially increase our national strength militarily. The stupid tasks of picking up cigarette butts, match sticks, etc., do not teach our soldiers the functions of warfare. To use the Army's own act as a reason; 17 weeks' training was considered sufficient to fit a man for combat; why is it they are now asking 52 weeks' training, three times as much?

I think one of the determining factors in our recent victory was numerical superiority in personnel, planes, guns, and all types of matériel.

And here is a very vital point that we should keep in mind: peacetime conscription for military training does deny the individuals affected the rights of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. If we allow this one encroachment upon our freedom are we not opening the door to those who would like to further subject us by restrictions of our personal freedom? I be-

lieve the recent events pertaining to demobilization clearly indicate the potential threat against that freedom as we have always known it.

I do not want to rear my son to be a number in the Army against his will. I feel it is his birthright to have the decision of his life, insofar as it does not transgress upon the rights of his fellow men, in his own hands during peacetime.

However we must have national defense and I sincerely believe a larger Regular Army and Navy, and expanded National Guard, ROTC, with perhaps, a new branch of training at the junior high school or high school to create an enlisted men reserve, but keep the entire program on a voluntary basis.

When our civilization reaches the point where we will not voluntarily defend ourselves, families, country, and way of life then our civilization will have reached a point where it ceases to be worth the sacrifice of armed defense. And at this point may I ask: are all the proponents of peacetime military training on a compulsory basis thinking of defense and only defense? Two years' Army service will cause a freedom-loving American to ask many questions.

I also believe the time-consuming factor in our present defense system is not the mobilization of military personnel, as illustrated by the Army 17 weeks' training program in conjunction with a Regular Army as cadre and a reserve of officers and enlisted men, but rather in the field of matériel, the time lag in manufacturing new war goods. For an illustration, our present equipment will be obsolete in a few years if it is not already obsolete due to the atomic bomb. Our best defense lies in the hands of a few scientific men and industrialists. A group of these men constantly working on new military weapons, in complete cooperation with the military, and simultaneously formulating production plans that will successfully tie in with our industrial set-up. And here is another point worth mentioning, can we take steps that will insure the acceptance and fair trial by the military of new or revolutionary matériel, methods, etc.? We do not want any Gen. Billy Mitchell type episodes in the future.

I have expressed my opinion as a citizen of the United States who is deeply concerned about the future and hope you will consider it as such.

Sincerely,

GERMAN BUSINESS STILL A MENACE— ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "German Business—Still a Menace," written by Senator THOMAS of Utah and published in the November 1945 issue of the American magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORLD COOPERATION—ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, at the mayor's dinner at the Francis Marion Hotel, Charleston, S. C., in connection with the Jimmy Byrnes Homecoming Day, November 16, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RED CROSS—ARTICLE BY AGNES E. MEYER

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the Red Cross, written by Agnes E. Meyer, and published in the Washington Post of November 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CRITIQUE OF LABOR LAW—ADDRESS BY PROF. WILLIAM STERNBERG

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address

entitled "Critique of Labor Law," delivered by Prof. William Sternberg, of Creighton University School of Law, Omaha, Nebr., before the Postwar Institute of the Nebraska Bar Association on October 31, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TO AN ATHLETE DYING YOUNG—SERMON BY REV. ALLEN PENDERGRAFT

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon entitled "To an Athlete Dying Young," delivered by Rev. Allen Pendergraft on November 4, 1945, at All Saints Church, Buffalo, N. Y., which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two letters received by him on the subject of universal military training, which appear in the Appendix.]

DELAY IN DISCHARGING SERVICEMEN

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three letters addressed to him on the subject of the discharge of servicemen, which appear in the Appendix.]

OUR CHILDREN—POEM BY EDWARD T. PACA

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Our Children," written by Edward T. Paca, of Englewood, Colo., which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 380)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States.

(For President's message see p. 10817 of the House proceedings of today's RECORD.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The message will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor [Mr. MURRAY], I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill which I send to the desk and request that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. The bill proposes to establish a national health program along the lines set forth by the President in his message on this subject just read. Representative DINGELL has introduced a companion bill in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 1606) to provide for a national health program, introduced by Mr. WAGNER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, in 1939 I introduced a national health bill, which was considered by the Committee on Education and Labor. The bill was given a favorable report by a subcommittee, but because of the war no action was taken.

In 1940, I, with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], introduced a hospi-

tal construction bill. The bill was reported out favorably by the Committee on Education and Labor and passed by the Senate.

During the past 5 years I have continued to study very carefully the entire health problem. The bill introduced today is an improved bill. It is the result of the constructive suggestions of many outstanding medical authorities and of labor, farm, consumer, and health organizations interested in improving the Nation's health.

The need for a national health program has been proved many times. In restating the need I should like to quote from a statement, Principles of a Nation-Wide Health Program, issued last year by 29 leading health experts, including 13 outstanding doctors. Here is what these experts said:

American medicine at its best is unsurpassed but it is also beyond doubt that the medical facilities and services actually available to many of our people are far below the best. There have been great achievements of the American medical profession, American hospitals, public health and welfare agencies in providing care for sickness, educating personnel, advancing medical knowledge, reducing and preventing disease. Nevertheless unmet needs for medical care are widespread and the burdens of sickness costs are heavy and sometimes overwhelming. There has been a gratifying reduction in the death rate, but the lowering of death rates is not an adequate measure of the extent to which medical care is available or needed. Moreover, the fact that death and disease rates are much greater in some States than in others, and greater among low than among high-income groups, demonstrates that there are still needs and opportunities.

Medical services should be made financially accessible to all through a national system of contributory health insurance, combined with taxation in behalf of people without sufficient income, preventive services and needed extensions and improvements of all facilities. In order that comprehensive service shall be available to all or most of the population and in order to minimize the administrative costs of acquiring members, it is essential that financial participation in the system be required by law. The contribution for medical-care insurance will not mean an added burden on the earnings of workers. The American people are now spending for physicians' services and hospitalization enough to provide for all with only minor supplementation, if these payments are regularized, instead of falling with disastrous uncertainty. Place should be maintained for voluntary action by many agencies as well as for action by our national, State, and local governments.

The same basic facts and proposals were contained in the official statement of policy on Medical Care in a National Health Program adopted in October 1944 by the American Public Health Association. Here is what that association said in its official statement:

I. A large portion of the population receives insufficient and inadequate medical care, chiefly because persons are unable to pay the costs of services on an individual-payment basis when they are needed, or because the services are not available.

II. There are extensive deficiencies in the physical facilities needed to provide reasonably adequate services. Such facilities include hospitals, health centers, and laboratories. The needs are most acute in poor communities, in rural areas, and in urban areas where the population has increased

rapidly or where the development of facilities has been haphazard or the financial support inadequate.

III. There are extensive deficiencies in the number and the distribution of personnel needed to provide the services. Here again, the needs vary according to categories of personnel and to characteristics of communities.

IV. There are extensive deficiencies in the number and categories of personnel qualified to administer facilities and services.

V. Many communities still are not served by public health departments; others inadequately maintain such departments. Thus, some communities have never utilized organized health work to reduce the burden of illness, and others share its benefits only in part. In these communities especially, people lack information on the benefits of modern medical care.

VI. Expansion of scientific research is urgently needed. Despite past and current scientific advances, knowledge as to the prevention, control, or cure of many diseases is lacking.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF HEALTH PROVISIONS

Mr. President, the bill which I have introduced includes five provisions which will make available basic health services to all the people wherever they may live and whatever their income may be.

First, the present Federal grants-in-aid to the States for public-health services are broadened and increased to speed up the progress of preventive and community-wide health services. It should therefore be possible, over a period of years, to assure that essential public-health services are available in all parts of the country, especially the rural areas which are so sadly in need of such services.

Second, the community-wide maternal and child-health services, aided by Federal grants to the States, are similarly broadened and strengthened.

Third, Federal grants-in-aid to the States are authorized for meeting the costs of medical care for needy persons.

At the present time there are 3,000,000 needy persons receiving cash assistance grants under Federal-State public assistance programs. However, Federal funds under existing laws cannot be used to match State or local expenditures which are made directly to doctors, dentists, nurses, hospitals, or other medical agencies.

By authorizing Federal grants to the States for meeting these direct medical expenditures, more adequate medical care will be made available to these persons; and hospitals and practitioners will receive more adequate compensation for their services.

Fourth, prepaid medical care is made available.

All four of the provisions which I have just mentioned will greatly help to round out the health services of the Nation. By preventing sickness, disability and premature death, they will pay vast dividends in human welfare and, at the same time, reduce the costs of other public and private welfare programs. Unless we provide a method of spreading the cost of medical and hospital care, people will still not obtain the treatment they need.

Fifth, grants-in-aid are provided under the prepaid medical care plan to non-profit institutions engaging in research or in professional education.

These 5 provisions are essential to the development of a broad national health program. They must, however, be supplemented by other provisions in order to assure a truly comprehensive national health program.

Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record as a part of my remarks the remainder of my statement, including questions and answers on the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT THE PREPAID MEDICAL CARE PROVISIONS OF THE NATIONAL HEALTH ACT OF 1945

1. Does the prepaid medical care title of the bill provide for "socialized medicine?"

No; if by the term "socialized medicine" is meant medical care furnished by Government doctors free of charge. The term "socialized medicine" has been loosely used for a number of years to describe any changes in the provision of medical services to which the American Medical Association leadership is opposed. The only definition of "socialize" in Webster's Dictionary which describes the effect of the bill on medical practice is "to adapt to social needs or uses." This title II of the bill will accomplish by making medical services more generally available than they are today, while retaining free choice of doctor for the patient and freedom on the doctor's part to work under the system or to remain out of it as he prefers. If it is charged that the bill proposes to make medical services more generally available than they are today, that charge is valid and is a compliment to the bill.

2. If, as Dr. Fishbein declares in his editorials in the Journal of the American Medical Association, health conditions and the standards of medical service are higher in the United States than anywhere else in the world, why is a change necessary?

The United States is not the healthiest country in the world. Dr. Fishbein presents a very favorable over-all picture but he neglects to state that conditions are not nearly so satisfactory in poor agricultural States, in rural regions of wealthy States, in low-income sections of our large cities, and among low-income groups in our population. Take, for example, the infant and maternal mortality rates. In 1942, while 40 babies in the entire United States died at birth for every 1,000 born alive, in 1 State the rate was 98, and 80 in another.

We find similar wide variation in maternal mortality rates. The rate for mothers who died in childbirth was 60 percent higher in the Southern States than in New England. The number of Negro mothers who died when their babies were born was twice the number of white mothers. Twenty-five percent more mothers died in towns and villages with less than 10,000 population than in the cities with population of 100,000 or more.

We are proud of our steady reduction in deaths from tuberculosis. Here again, however, the over-all favorable picture conceals many inequalities. In New York City one over-crowded district has a death rate from this cause which is 30 times the rate in more favored districts. The highest tuberculosis mortality rates for several States are four to five times the average in the States with the best records.

Probably few people would have believed, 6 years ago, that more than half of our young men would be found physically or mentally unfit for general military duty. Yet that is exactly what was revealed by Selective Service examination records of the first 3,000,000 registrants. Soon after the early days of the war, certain of the physical standards were relaxed. Nevertheless, recent figures from

Selective Service still show the appalling fact that 50 percent of the young men examined were either completely unable to perform general military service or were made fit only after correction of defects. Out of 14,000,000 men (most of them under 30) examined by June 1, 1944, 4,500,000 were classified as IV-F, unfit for military service despite the lowered physical and mental requirements for military service; more than 1,000,000 after being inducted were later discharged for defects which became apparent after induction; and 1,500,000 were inducted but made fit for service only after certain defects had been corrected—giving a total of 7,000,000 that were initially unfit. Another fact stands out from the Selective Service figures: 1,500,000 of the 7,000,000 unfit were rehabilitated for military service readily and the numbers of such rehabilitated cases could have been easily doubled, indicating that with adequate medical care the proportion of unfit would have been much less.

Length of life is often considered a measure of the health of the people. Yet statistics of life expectancy for males in prewar years showed a number of countries in which the average future length of life was greater than in the United States. For example: At birth, life expectancy in at least 4 countries was better than that for white males in the United States; at age 20, life expectancy in 8 countries exceeded that in the United States; at age 60, the United States was exceeded by at least 12 countries.

Most of these are health insurance countries. In the United States, inability to pay the costs of medical care prevents many people from receiving the care they need and limits doctors in the kind and amount of care they can provide. People who don't see a doctor don't get any kind of care—good or bad. Many doctors are unable or unequipped, because of the cost to the patient, to make use of the marvels of medical science which are described so glowingly by some medical spokesmen. Patients of these doctors get a type of medical care not much better than that their fathers and grandfathers received.

3. Is it true that if the prepayment provisions of the bill are enacted into law "they will destroy the private practice of medicine in the United States"?

This statement is not true. If the bill is enacted into law, physicians will continue to practice medicine much as they do now. They will have the choice of practicing full time under the system, of combining care of patients paid for by the system with care of uninsured patients and of those who prefer to pay for their care privately (that is, without making use of their prepaid protection), or of continuing to practice full time outside the system. Whether caring for prepaid patients or for others, they will be free, as they are now, to practice alone or as members of a group.

Patients will be free to choose their general practitioners and to change them if their first choice proves unsatisfactory. Doctors will be equally free to accept or reject patients who choose them. Free choice is explicitly guaranteed in the bill (sec. 205).

4. Is it true that under the bill the "entire medical profession in the United States would be placed under the direction of one man, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service"?

No. This is not true. Section 203 in the bill, which relates to administration, is concerned not with the administration of medical practice but with the administration of a system of paying for medical care.

The provisions in the bill do not interfere with the professional aspects of medical practice. The Surgeon General is "authorized to negotiate and periodically to renegotiate agreements or cooperative working arrangements" with the medical profession and with hospitals to "utilize their services and facilities and to pay fair, reasonable, and equitable compensation for such service and facilities."

The usual method of making payments to general practitioners is to be that which is chosen by the majority of physicians in any given local areas. However, provision is also made that, if approved by the Surgeon General, other methods of payment may be made to physicians who do not choose the method of the majority. It should be noted that the Surgeon General wouldn't hire doctors for the prepaid services or direct the medical profession. He is authorized to work out mutually satisfactory agreements or cooperative working arrangements with the doctors as to methods by which they would be paid for their services to insured persons. The same holds true for methods of payment to dentists.

In adopting the basic policies that would guide these arrangements, the Surgeon General is required to consult with the National Advisory Medical Policy Council, on which the medical and dental profession will be adequately represented through members they nominate.

5. It is said that the National Advisory Medical Policy Council will have no authority—will be merely a puppet council. Is this true?

No. This is not true. The council has been given no final administrative authority, because an advisory council is not and should not be an administrative body. An explicit statement in the bill which bound the Surgeon General to follow the advice of the advisory council in every instance would hamper his freedom of action to an unreasonable extent and would deprive him of the necessary authority to carry out his duties and responsibilities. He is, however, bound to consult them on all matters of policy. The bill is explicit and detailed in its description of the administrative policies on which the Surgeon General is authorized to act, only after consultation with the council (section 205).

In appointing the members of the advisory council, the Surgeon General is required to select them from panels of names submitted by professional and other agencies and organizations concerned with medical, dental, and nursing services and education, with the operation of hospitals and laboratories, and from other persons, agencies, or organizations informed on the need for or provision of medical, hospital, or related services and benefits. It will, therefore, be a council composed of experts in the various fields and of representatives of the public. No responsible administrator would dare to act contrary to the advice of an advisory council of this character on any matter of importance unless he had adequate grounds on which he could defend his position publicly. Moreover, the Surgeon General is required to include in his annual report to Congress an account of his consultations with the advisory council, and also their recommendations and his comments thereon.

6. Isn't \$3,000,000,000 a year an enormous amount of money to spend on medical care and hospitalization?

Absolutely not. We spend more than this now for all medical care. The sums of money to be allocated to the personal health services account will not for the most part represent new expenditures. To the extent that they do—through budgeted expenditures—the people will receive much more service than they do today.

Medical care ordinarily costs the people of this country in direct payments and through taxation about four to five billion dollars a year. Direct expenditures by the people themselves amount to about three to four billion dollars. About two to two and one-half billion dollars is spent in an ordinary nonwar year for medical services excluding dentistry and home nursing.

7. Is it true that the Surgeon General will assign all patients to all doctors?

Certainly not. In each area patients will have free choice of all general practitioners

of medicine or dentistry within the system (sec. 205 (b)).

8. Will the hospitalization provisions in the bill destroy the voluntary hospital system?

No; this is nonsense. Nothing in the bill provides for or would even permit any interference in the internal management of any hospitals—private, public, or sectarian. This is explicitly forbidden in the bill (sec. 206 (c)). All hospitals which meet acceptable standards—such standards as those utilized by the American Medical Association or the American College of Surgeons in determining whether or not hospitals shall be included in its annual register—would as a matter of course be included in the list of hospitals eligible to receive insured patients. In communities where hospital facilities are sparse there will undoubtedly be commonsense modification of these standards. There is explicit provision in the bill for this (sec. 214 (k)). The object is to make hospital care more available to people—not less available.

Each qualified hospital is also guaranteed the right to choose how it will be paid. The hospital can be paid direct under a mutually satisfactory agreement. Or it can be paid by the patient, who receives his benefit in cash at so many dollars per day of hospital care (sec. 214 (h)).

The assurance of adequate income should enable hospitals to improve their facilities. The type of records which will be required will be no more difficult for hospitals to keep—perhaps less difficult—than those required by the Blue Cross plans.

9. Will the provisions for grants-in-aid for medical education mean that medical education will be controlled by the Surgeon General and that he will dictate which men and women may become medical students?

Of course not. The provisions of section 213 of the bill give the Surgeon General no such authority. The purpose of this provision is to provide needed funds for the stimulation and support of research and medical education. Projects must be initiated by the medical schools and research foundations themselves. Such requests must, of course, be approved by the Surgeon General after consultation with the advisory council, to make sure that public funds are wisely spent.

This provision was put in the bill as a result of suggestions made by the medical profession in regard to the earlier Wagner health bill of 1939. It seems only proper that the people who profit so much by the advancements of medical science and improvements in medical education should contribute in this way to these desirable ends.

10. Is it true that the bill would be used to "take over" medical schools and hospitals?

Of course not. There is absolutely nothing in the bill which would authorize or even permit this. Nothing in the bill permits interference in the internal management of either medical schools or hospitals. The payment of hospital benefits to hospitals and of grants-in-aid to medical schools will provide a financial security that many institutions have never before possessed. This assurance of necessary funds should strengthen and stimulate them to do more effective work than they have ever done before, without in any way giving up independence and freedom of action.

11. Is it true that the enactment of the bill will plunge the physicians into political slavery?

Absolutely no. This statement has been made by opponents of a national prepayment plan to confuse and disturb physicians and others. There is nothing "political" about the office of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. The Surgeon General holds a term appointment. The United States Public Health Service has a long and honorable record of almost 150 years. Many of the advances in public health which the

editorials in certain medical journals credit to the private practitioners of medicine have been stimulated by the activities of the Public Health Service and by similar public agencies.

12. Is it true that under the hospitalization provisions of the bill people will not be able to choose their hospitals?

People do not usually have free choice of hospitals today. Ordinarily, they go to the hospital in which the physician treating them has a staff appointment. Sometimes they have a choice of two or more hospitals in the community. They will have the same freedom under the provisions of the bill. They will have as much free choice of hospitals as they have today under the Blue Cross plans. All hospitals in good standing will undoubtedly elect to receive insured patients in order to obtain the assurance of guaranteed income which will thus be available to them.

13. Will people be obliged to take any doctor the Surgeon General tells them to, if this bill becomes law?

Certainly not. The bill expressly provides free choice of general practitioners (sec. 205 (b)). Ordinarily, a patient will go to a specialist only on the recommendation of his physician. This is for the protection of the patient. Most people should see a general practitioner first before they go to a specialist. The patient who goes to a specialist on the advice of a physician is likely to be taken care of more satisfactorily than if he follows the suggestion of a neighbor or picks out a name in the telephone book. The same statements apply to dentists.

14. The bill says the Surgeon General can limit the number of patients a physician will be allowed to treat. Won't that keep people from having the doctor of their choice?

Not any more than at present when a patient chooses a doctor who already has all the patients he can take care of. This provision in the bill (sec. 205 (j)) is merely permissive. It states that the "Surgeon General may prescribe maximum limits to the number of potential beneficiaries for whom a practitioner or group of practitioners may undertake to furnish general medical benefits * * *". It does not require the Surgeon General to do so. Protection of patients and doctors was the only purpose in giving the Surgeon General permission to set a maximum. Such a maximum would undoubtedly be the largest number of persons whom one doctor could take care of satisfactorily. It would therefore be a larger number than doctors ordinarily take care of. As a result, this provision, if the Surgeon General found it wise to use it, would rarely, if ever, interfere with the guaranteed freedom of insured persons to choose their own doctors.

15. Does the bill place in the hands of one man—the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service—the power and authority * * * to designate which doctors can be specialists?

Questions like this one confuse and disturb physicians and the public because they can be answered by neither a flat "yes" nor a flat "no." Under the prepaid program, specialists would be compensated at a higher rate than general practitioners. This is only fair and proper. To provide a measure for determining what types of services and which practitioners should be compensated at this higher rate, the Surgeon General is authorized in the bill to set up general standards for this purpose. In establishing these standards, he must, however, consult the advisory council and utilize standards and certifications already developed by physicians through their professional organizations.

16. Will the enactment of the bill result in the deterioration of medical practice?

On the contrary, it should improve the standards of medical practice. Many doctors are hampered today in their treatment

of patients by the inability of the patient to pay for the special diagnostic and treatment services he requires. The provisions for consultant and specialist services, for hospital care, and for X-ray and laboratory services as benefits under the bill will mean that doctors can make use of these services whenever they consider it advisable, without considering the patient's pocketbook.

17. Doesn't the phrase giving the Surgeon General the authority to "prescribe and publish such rules and regulations," used in section 203 (f) of the bill, mean that the Surgeon General will have too much power?

This phrase has been frequently quoted to convey just this impression. But no administrator can administer a national prepayment plan without setting up certain rules and regulations. It is a phrase commonly used in bills. It has no sinister significance. It merely gives the administrator the power to establish necessary administrative measures. He is specifically forbidden from using the "rules and regulations" to act contrary to the other provisions of the bill.

18. It has been said that if the bill becomes law people must depend upon "a doctor who is paid by the Government and is presumably working 8 hours a day instead of 24." Won't this make it very hard for people to get a doctor if they need one at night or on holidays?

Certainly not. Any such idea is nonsense and an insult to the medical profession. There is not one statement in the bill which even implies that doctors are to work any specified number of hours. Many a doctor who answers a patient's call today has no idea when or whether he will be paid for his services. Why should we assume that doctors will look after their patients less conscientiously when they know they will be paid than they do today when payment is often uncertain?

19. Is it true that, under a system of prepaid medical care, physicians will have lower incomes than they have now?

With 60,000 physicians in the armed services during the war, of course, those left in private practice have been overworked and their incomes have been very high. They would not be so high in an ordinary year. If the question really means "will physicians have lower incomes under the bill than they usually have" the answer certainly is "no." Before the war, the highest average gross income physicians ever made was in 1928 or 1929—again years when all incomes were unusually high. In those years physicians earned on the average about \$9,000 gross, but in the years since then and before the war their average incomes have been from \$5,600 to \$8,500 gross.

It is estimated that on the average \$1,500,000,000 annually could be spent for physicians' services. At this rate, if 150,000 physicians were in full-time practice, they would average about \$10,000 income in a normal year under the bill. Like the previous figures, this includes incomes of both general practitioners and specialists. The general practitioner earns less than the specialist and, as the bill provides, the qualified specialist will continue to receive a higher rate of pay than the general practitioner. Thus, specialists as a whole would receive more than the \$10,000 average, and general practitioners as a whole somewhat less than the average.

20. It is claimed by opponents of a national plan that voluntary prepayment plans could do the job as well, if not better. Is this true?

Experience here and abroad has shown us that voluntary plans could not handle the job. You can't persuade enough people, much less the bulk of the people, to join voluntary plans. Moreover, the voluntary plans which have been operating so far are too restrictive and too costly in the care they provide. There has been a lot of talk about Blue Cross (hospitalization) plans being able

to handle hospital care; but even after more than 15 years of existence these plans cover only seventeen to eighteen million people—most of these in large urban centers. Hospitalization is the easiest kind of insurance in the medical field to sell. Voluntary plans that provide medical care now cover only about 4 percent of the population in spite of recent and very vigorous efforts of the American Medical Association and State medical societies to promote this type of plan. The medical society plans now cover only a few million persons. For the most part they give care only when the patient is in the hospital.

Without exception, voluntary plans are too expensive for the lower-income groups (the people who are most in need of medical care) and there are too many illnesses for which care is not given under these plans.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION BILL

The Senate Committee on Education and Labor has already favorably reported out S. 191, the hospital survey and construction bill which will enable hospitals, clinics, and public health centers to be built in communities where they are needed. While the bill has several defects and inadequacies it is an important beginning. By constructing hospitals in rural areas, and other areas where they are needed, it will be possible to speed up the progress of comprehensive hospital care. In turn, the prepayment of medical care costs, including the costs of hospitalization, will assure the maintenance of the hospitals which will be built and will encourage the construction and improvement of needed hospitals. A sound hospital-construction program requires that there is also an insurance system to cover hospitalization costs in order to make sure that hospitals will be used by sick persons and that satisfactory wages, hours, and working conditions of hospital employees will insure high standards of hospital maintenance.

MEDICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

The Senate Committee on Military Affairs already has before it legislation providing for the promotion of medical research and professional education. The passage of such legislation should help to advance medical discoveries, to improve the quality of medical research in our universities and medical schools, and to make it possible to give opportunities for further training and education to many more young men and women. At the present time many promising individuals are denied this opportunity because of lack of financial means and because of the restrictions which the medical schools apply particularly to persons of minority groups.

The National Health Act which I have introduced contains provision for medical research and education, particularly in section 314 (f) (1) and 314 (l) of the Public Health Service Act (pt. A of title I of the bill) and section 213 of title II of the bill.

The amended provisions in the Public Health Service Act will make additional Federal funds available to the States through the United States Public Health Service for public health research, training of personnel, public health education, and planning and coordination of health services and activities.

Section 213 of the bill provides that, as a part of the prepaid medical care program, the Surgeon General is directed, with the advice of the National Advisory Medical Policy Council, to administer grants-in-aid to nonprofit institutions and agencies engaging in research or in undergraduate or postgraduate professional education. Such grants would be made for projects showing promise of making valuable contributions to the education and training of persons in furnishing health benefits or of making valuable contributions with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of disease or disability. Provision is made

for giving preference to educational projects for returning servicemen seeking postgraduate education or training in medical, dental, and related fields. The initial sums available for such grants-in-aid would be \$10,000,000 for 1946 and \$15,000,000 for 1947. The sum available each subsequent year for such grants-in-aid would be 2 percent of the amount expended for health benefits. These grants-in-aid are a necessary part of any prepaid medical-care program. They will enable medical schools to develop more adequate programs for general practitioners, specialists, and other medical personnel to take refresher and postgraduate courses so that such persons can keep abreast of modern medical discoveries. Under present-day arrangements the results of new discoveries are not brought quickly enough to the attention of all practitioners.

The GI bill of rights contains educational provisions and loans which also should help during the next few years to break down the barriers to further professional education and research which have existed. But the GI bill will only apply for a limited period of time to only part of the population. We must have permanent and comprehensive legislation covering all medical research and education and allied fields. Such legislation under a national health program should, of course, provide for coordination with general research and education programs.

CASH BENEFITS DURING DISABILITY

A comprehensive national-health program cannot be achieved without providing cash benefits to individuals during periods of sickness or disability. I have already introduced legislation with Senator MURRAY (S. 1050) and Representative DINGELL has introduced a companion bill in the House of Representatives (H. R. 3293) which provides for such payments during both temporary or extended sickness or disability as a part of our other cash social insurance payments. This legislation already is pending before the Senate Committee on Finance and the House Committee on Ways and Means. These pending bills also provide that there should be set aside annually an amount equal to 2 percent of the social insurance benefits paid on behalf of all such disabled individuals to be used for medical, surgical, institutional, rehabilitation, or other services to disabled individuals entitled to receive cash disability insurance benefits, if such services are not otherwise available through existing legislation, and might aid such individuals to return to gainful work.

I am hopeful that Committees of the Senate and House which have this matter now before them will hold hearings on it soon to expedite this legislation as part of both a national health program and an expanded social security program.

OTHER HEALTH LEGISLATION

There also are pending before the Congress at the present time several other special bills relating to health, each limited to a particular problem. While each problem—and each bill—has certain merit, piecemeal consideration of each separate problem by the Congress is not the most satisfactory way of developing a sound national health program. Such a piecemeal approach inevitably results in gaps, overlaps, and inconsistencies; it may result in competition for trained personnel to administer such programs, especially in cases where a sufficient number of trained persons is not yet available. I hope, therefore, that each such pending bill will be considered in relation to a comprehensive national health program.

The appropriate committees of Congress also should go into all aspects of health which impede providing adequate medical care. The present deplorable situation with respect to institutional care in many communities indicates the need for Federal grants-in-aid to the States for the improvement of standards, services, and working and living

conditions in these institutions. State licensure laws are so complex, so lacking in uniformity, and so obstructive of interstate mobility of qualified practitioners that some Federal legislation is necessary to bring order out of this chaos. There are no medical schools in some States, and measures to remedy this defect should be considered. Finally, the discrimination which most medical schools practice against student applicants from minority groups requires congressional consideration and appropriate action.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE NATIONAL HEALTH ACT OF 1945

The National Health Act of 1945 contains three titles, as follows:

Title I—Grants to States for Health Services.

Title II—Personal Health Service Benefits.

Title III—General Provisions.

TITLE I—GRANTS TO STATES FOR HEALTH SERVICES

Title I contains three parts, as follows:

Part A—Grants to States for Public Health Services.

Part B—Grants to States for Maternal and Child Health Services.

Part C—Grants to States for Medical Care of Needy Persons.

All three parts of title I provided grants-in-aid to the States for health services for which the Federal Government already provides funds. In general, the purpose of this title is to amend and broaden existing legislation by eliminating existing restrictions so that present State and local programs can operate more effectively.

PART A—GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

This section amends section 314 of the Public Health Service Act. The provisions concerned with grants for the venereal disease and for the tuberculosis programs are unchanged. The subsections dealing with general public-health work are revised so as to strengthen the program and pledge complete Federal cooperation to the States in moving as rapidly as practicable toward the development of adequate public-health services in all parts of the country. The present authorization of \$20,000,000 a year for grants to States is replaced by an authorization to appropriate a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes. Also, the maximum annual amount authorized to be available to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for demonstrations, training of personnel, and administrative expenses is increased from \$3,000,000 to \$5,000,000 a year.

In order to receive the Federal grants the States are required to develop their own plans in accordance with their own needs, and to submit these plans for approval. They must be approved by the Surgeon General if they meet the requirements that are specified in the bill. An orderly system of arrangements is laid down, insuring reasonable standards and systematic financial participation by the States. This is the same general pattern as has been followed for public assistance since the original Social Security Act of 1935. The amounts of the grants to States are determined by an explicit formula, designed to give proportionately more aid to the poorer States. The variable Federal grants would range from 50 to 75 percent of the total public funds expended under the approved State programs.

Section 314 (k) of the Public Health Service Act provides for coordination between the administration of the public health services under this program with the services provided under the other programs in the bill.

PART B—GRANTS TO STATES FOR MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

This section relates to Federal cooperation with the States to provide health services for mothers and children. A common plan is followed in each of the two aspects of this

part, dealing respectively with maternal and child health and with crippled children. In order to receive Federal grants, the States are to develop their own plans, in accordance with their own needs. If these plans meet the requirements specified in the bill, they must be approved by the Chief of the Children's Bureau. The requirements are those that are essential to insure reasonable standards, systematic financing and administration, and reasonably rapid extension of the services to all parts of the States and on an adequate basis. Administration by the Federal authorities is required to be in close consultation with the State authorities.

As in the case of grants for public-health work and medical care for needy persons, the Federal grants in part B would be on a variable basis, so as to give special aid to the poorer States. The variable Federal grants would range from 50 to 75 percent of the total public funds expended under the approved State programs, the amount in each case being determined by a specific formula written into the bill. The Federal Government would be entering into full partnership with the States in providing services for mothers and children, leaving wide latitude to the States as to the scope and content of the programs.

Section 128 (c) of this part provides for coordination between the administration of the provisions under this program with the services provided under the other programs in the bill.

PART C—GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAL CARE OF NEEDY PERSONS

This section provides Federal grants to States for medical care to persons determined by the States to be needy under a cooperative Federal-State plan of public assistance. It provides variable Federal grants to the States, ranging from 50 percent to 75 percent of the total expended, depending upon the State's per capita income. The higher rates apply to the States with the lower per capita incomes. The program authorizes Federal matching, on this variable-grant basis, of medical care for any needy individual (without the rigid maxima contained in existing law).

These Federal grants, like the similar provisions of the present law, are to be made out of general revenues. As under existing law, State plans must meet various requirements specified in the bill, including maintenance of civil-service merit standards for administrative personnel.

The limitations in the existing Federal law are removed so that States may obtain Federal funds to help provide medical care to needy persons and thereby to reduce illness and suffering and wherever possible to help needy persons to be restored to self-support. Most States are already providing such care under existing public-welfare laws, but, because of the restrictions in the Federal law, this care is not adequate. By providing Federal financial participation toward meeting part of such costs, States will be encouraged to broaden the scope and improve the quality of such medical care.

In view of the fact that the proposed legislation would make additional Federal funds available to every State in the Union, it is essential that the State programs provide more adequate assistance and improved and simplified administration. Since under this part the largest part of the total cost will come from Federal funds, it is reasonable that all persons in the United States who are actually determined to be needy by State agencies be given medical care. The bill provides that as a condition for obtaining Federal funds the State public-assistance plan must provide for distribution of funds so as to assure meeting in full the medical need of individuals throughout the State as determined in accordance with standards established by the State. This provision would not modify the existing law which places upon the State the responsibility for determining

who is a needy individual and the amount of assistance to be granted such individual. It is designed, however, to assure that needy individuals in a particular county will not be denied assistance because of the lack of adequate local financial participation by such county.

Section 136 of this part provides for coordination between the administration of medical care under this program with the services provided under the other programs in the bill.

TITLE II—PREPAID PERSONAL HEALTH SERVICE BENEFITS

Title II of the bill provides for a system of prepaid personal health service benefits.

Section 212 of the bill establishes a personal health services account, out of which all the benefits under this title are to be paid.

The financial barrier to adequate hospital and medical care is the basic reason for the unequal distribution of doctors and hospitals as between urban and rural area and as between prosperous and underprivileged communities. It is the basic reason for the failure of low-income families to receive as much medical care as the well-to-do, although they have more sickness. It is an important cause of the shockingly high rate of rejections under selective service.

A system of prepaid medical care will go a long way toward breaking down this financial barrier. Such a system will enable the people to obtain all needed medical care and will give them security against catastrophic costs for which they cannot budget individually. It will encourage doctors to settle in rural areas and communities to construct needed hospitals and health centers by assuring adequate incomes, equipment, and facilities for modern medical practice. It will benefit patients, doctors, and hospitals.

Title II of the bill provides for a comprehensive system of prepaid medical care. The provisions of the bill are based upon long and careful study of existing prepayment medical care plans in this country and abroad. The provisions of the bill are consistent with the policies and program set forth (1) in the Report of the Health Program Conference on Principles of a Nation-wide Health Program, issued in 1944 by 29 leading health experts, including 13 medical doctors; (2) in the report on medical care in a national health program, adopted in 1944 by the American Public Health Association; (3) in the policies set forth in the recent statement on the people's health, issued by the Physician's Forum; and (4) in statement No. 16, issued October 3, 1945, by the Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care. Representatives of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations joined in the adoption of the first-named report. The provisions of the bill are consistent with the policies and programs set down by both the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations in their annual conventions.

A Nation-wide comprehensive prepayment medical-care plan can be financed in any one of several different ways. Premiums can, for such a purpose, be raised through income or general taxes or through pay roll contributions, or both. In either case minimum and maximum provision can be provided. The extent of a general governmental contribution out of general revenues to such a plan depends upon the comprehensiveness of the groups covered and the services provided. All in all, these problems are best decided after a decision has been reached on all the details of the medical-care plan itself. Moreover, the financial details relating to the raising of the revenue for the plan raises many special problems which have a bearing on existing income taxes and pay roll contributions and should be considered in relation to these laws.

The bill does not, therefore, specify any particular method by which the sums authorized to be appropriated under section 212 of title II would be raised. Since under the Constitution legislation relating to the raising of revenue must originate in the House of Representatives, this matter has been left to separate legislation. There is already pending before the Congress legislation (H. R. 3293 and the companion bill S. 1050) which provides for the raising of revenue for personal health service benefits. This separation of legislation between the revenue and benefit aspects of the program is in keeping with previous practice. In both 1935 and 1937 legislation relating to railroad retirement was considered and enacted in this way.

It is both necessary and desirable that first and foremost consideration should be given to the benefits. If the Congress thinks that it is sound to provide prepaid medical care to the American people, the method of financing such a plan can be worked out jointly by the appropriate committees of the Congress which have jurisdiction over these matters.

PREPAID MEDICAL CARE IS NOT SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Propagandists for some organized medical groups have criticized a national prepaid medical-care on the ground that it involves "regimentation of doctors and patients," "lowered standards," "political medicine," and "socialized medicine," and so on. But prepaid medical care is not socialized medicine; it is not state medicine. These "devil words" are all designed to confuse the issue.

A system of prepaid medical care is simply a method of assuring a person ready access to the medical care that he or she needs by eliminating the financial barrier between the patient and doctor or hospital. Since patients are guaranteed free choice of doctors, doctors are guaranteed the right to accept or reject patients, and hospitals are guaranteed freedom to manage their affairs, it should be obvious that the system does not involve regimentation of doctors, hospitals, or patients. Neither do I believe the propaganda that the doctors of this country will lower the standards of medical care simply because they are guaranteed payment for their services.

There are many individuals, honest and sincere in their desire for improved conditions, who nevertheless fear any change, and distrust all new social legislation. Those of us who have sponsored social legislation have faced similar opposition against many proposals for social betterment, but we have persevered and succeeded, and we have seen these new programs accepted as part of our basic system of American freedom and democracy. Over 30 years ago in the New York Legislature I fought for workmen's accident compensation and most of the arguments which are being made against prepaid medical care now were made against workmen's compensation then. Now all of the States but one have workmen's compensation laws—all include medical benefits, which is health insurance for industrial accidents and disease. The time has come for us to extend the principle of health insurance to cover nonindustrial accidents and diseases as well.

The fears and doubts expressed about workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, and other measures for social security have proved to be without foundation. In the future, when we have succeeded in our struggle for a comprehensive health program for the entire country, we will be able to say about health insurance, too, that present-day apprehensions and misgivings were groundless.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE SAFEGUARDED

Freedom of medical practice is carefully safeguarded. Each person is entitled to

choose his own family doctor from among all physicians or groups of physicians in the community who have voluntarily agreed to go into the system. Each doctor or group of doctors is free to go in or stay out of the system. These doctors who participate are free to accept or reject patients who may wish to select them as their family doctor, and the participating doctors are specifically given the right to choose the method through which they are to be paid for the services they furnish. Patients and doctors may change the arrangements after they have been made if they become dissatisfied. Doctors practicing as specialists, individually or in groups, would be entitled to special rates of payment if they meet professional standards for specialists. Existing arrangements for hospital care would not be disturbed.

Every effort also has been made to protect the professional position of dentists, nurses, and nursing organizations. Hospitals are guaranteed protection against interference in the management of their own affairs. The basic policy has been to provide medical and related services through arrangements that are worked out so that they will be satisfactory to the public and to those who furnish the services. Mutual agreements, reached through negotiations and contracts, are specified in the bill as the method to be used, and that is the democratic way of doing things.

The Surgeon General is authorized to negotiate cooperative working arrangements with Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, and with private groups or individuals, to provide the benefits by utilizing their services and facilities on payment of fair and reasonable compensation. The health benefits may be furnished to noncovered persons such as needy persons receiving public assistance, if appropriate arrangements are made to pay on their behalf the cost of services furnished to them.

VOLUNTARY PLANS AIDED

There has been much misunderstanding about the part that voluntary hospitals, group-service organizations, existing voluntary insurance or prepayment plans and similar agencies may play in a prepaid medical-care system. Let me emphasize that our bill makes a place for them, so that they can continue their good work. All qualified hospitals, all qualified medical groups or organizations, will be able to participate in the program as organizations that will furnish services to the insured persons who choose them; they will receive fair payments for the services they furnish under the bill; and they will have enlarged opportunities to be service agencies for particular groups or for their communities. This applies to service organizations created by trade unions, consumer groups, employers, nonprofit community groups, churches, fraternal associations, groups of doctors or individual doctors, medical societies, or many other kinds of sponsors, or groups of sponsors. The bill not only provides for utilizing existing service organizations but it also encourages the creation of new ones.

The groups operating under the Blue Cross hospital-insurance plans will be able to continue to act as representative of the participating hospitals and the community groups that own or manage the hospitals, and they will have large opportunities to be important public organizations that facilitate the administration of vital parts of the insurance system. The same will be true for many other community and public organizations.

Medical service groups—private clinics, salaried staffs of hospitals, group-service plans such as the Kaiser or the Ross-Loos plan—furnishing service under the system would be as free as they are today to select their own staffs and their own method of paying physicians and others on their staffs, irrespective of the method of payment which

prevailed among the individually practicing physicians or dentists of the local area.

HOSPITAL CARE

Hospital care is limited to 60 days per year, with a possible maximum of 120 days if experience proves that such benefits can be afforded. All qualified hospitals are eligible to participate. The Surgeon General is forbidden from exercising supervision or control over the management of hospitals that participate in the system.

DECENTRALIZED ADMINISTRATION

Every effort has been made to keep a fair balance in the bill between the principles of administrative responsibility and democratic administration. The administrative officers are given duties to perform and the necessary authority so that they can carry out their duties efficiently and promptly. But their authority is carefully limited through checks and balances. Limitations are carefully specified in the bill; for example, the rights of insured persons and of physicians and hospitals are set down.

Moreover, the Surgeon General is directed to decentralize the administration of the program to the maximum extent possible, and administration through the States and localities is given preference and priority wherever the State and local authorities wish to take over the responsibility. Where no such arrangements have been made, the Surgeon General is directed to establish committees in each locality to aid in the administration of the program and to assure that the program will be adapted to local needs. Such committees shall include representatives of the insured population, doctors, hospitals, other agencies furnishing service under the program, and other persons informed on the need for, or provision of, health benefits. These provisions assure that there will not be any dictatorship or regimentation under the bill, as some propagandists have implied.

The Surgeon General is directed to establish a National Advisory Policy Council with which he is required to consult on all important questions of policy and administration. Members of this Advisory Council would be appointed from panels of names submitted by professional and other organizations concerned with medical services, education, hospitals, etc. The Advisory Council must also include representatives of the public. The Surgeon General is required to make a full report to the Congress each year on the administration of the program. Such report must include a record of the consultations with the Advisory Council, recommendations of the council, and any comments thereon. Such a report assures that all relevant facts, opinions, recommendations, and actions of the Surgeon General and the Advisory Council will be public information and that the Congress has full information upon which to revise or amend the law. To assure that the Advisory Council will and can meet on its own motion the bill provides that the council shall meet not less frequently than twice a year and whenever at least four members request a meeting. The bill also provides that the council itself and each of its members shall be provided by the Surgeon General with secretarial, clerical, or other assistants. Finally, the council itself may establish special advisory, technical, regional, or local committees or commissions, whose membership may include members of the Advisory Council or other persons or both, to advise upon general or special questions, professional and technical subjects, questions concerning administration, problems affecting regions or localities, and related matters.

The bill specifically provides that all such councils—national and local—are to be only advisory to the appropriate administrative officers. Some medical groups have strongly advocated that the advice of such councils

should be binding upon the administrator; that the national council should have power to veto the action of the administrator; and that the council should approve all regulations before they are issued. Such provisions have not been included in the bill because they are contrary to sound principles of public administration. Such a provision would result in the delegation of public authority to private persons. It would bestow upon private interests the control of the entire program. Only in recent years has it become apparent that adequate medical care is as much a concern to the consumer of medical care—the public—as to the producers and distributors of medical care. The technical and professional aspects of medical or hospital care should be under the constant control and supervision of qualified professional personnel. But sound public policy demands that on other aspects of medical care—such as financial matters and the administration of medical care—the public must have a voice and the controlling interest.

Throughout the bill, there are specific provisions requiring the Surgeon General to consult with the National Advisory Council on particular matters. Thus, section 205 (c) requires that in determining what are specialist or consultant services (for the purpose of higher rates of remuneration to persons rendering such services), the Surgeon General must establish general standards only after consultation with the advisory council. Similarly, in connection with, including any hospital on the list of participating hospitals, section 206 (b) requires that the Surgeon General make his finding of facts and decisions on the status of any hospital in accordance with general standards established only after consultation with the advisory council. In placing any limitations on benefits under section 210 the Surgeon General must also first consult the advisory council.

Moreover, section 204 (b) of the bill specifically states that the Advisory Council shall advise the Surgeon General on—but it is not limited to—the following seven matters:

1. Professional standards of quality to apply to personal health service benefits;
2. Designation of specialists and consultants;
3. Methods and arrangements to stimulate and encourage the attainment of high standards through coordination of the services of general or family practitioners, specialists and consultants, laboratories, and other auxiliary services, and through the coordination of the services of physicians and dentists with those of educational and research institutions, hospitals and public-health centers, and through other useful means;
4. Standards to apply to participating hospitals, to the relations or coordination among hospitals, and to the establishment and maintenance of the list of participating hospitals;
5. Adequate and suitable methods and arrangements of paying for personal health service benefits;
6. Studies and surveys of personal health services and of the quality and adequacy of such services; and
7. Grants-in-aid for professional education and research projects.

The bill places responsibility for the sound administration of the prepaid medical-care program in the hands of the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. The office of the Surgeon General is and has been nonpolitical and has developed close and satisfactory relations with State and local health officers and with officials and members of the American Medical Association. By placing responsibility in the hands of a single administrator long versed in medical administration, prompt, efficient, and economical administration of the prepaid medical-care system can be assured.

Some organized medical groups have criticized this provision on the grounds that it centralizes too much authority in one man and that it tends toward medical dictatorship. As I have indicated, I do not think there is any merit to this charge. But if the Congress should come to the conclusion that there is any merit to this criticism, it could place the responsibility for the over-all administration of the program in the hands of a board of say three or five persons, with the possibility of utilizing the Surgeon General as the administrative officer of such a board. If such an arrangement is adopted it should be clear, however, that all or the majority of the members of the board should be full-time public members with no financial or other interest which would be inconsistent with their responsibility for nonpartisan, competent administration in the public interest. Any other arrangements would be contrary to the best interests of the consumers of medical care.

Specific provision is included in the bill for hearings and appeals on any disputed issues between practitioners, hospitals, and covered persons. Specific provision is made for the judicial review of any disputed issues arising under the plan. Here again, the bill establishes adequate protection against any regimentation or dictatorship.

HIGH MEDICAL STANDARDS ENCOURAGED

High standards of medical care are protected and encouraged through incentives for the professional advancement of doctors, postgraduate study, professional education, research, and the availability—regardless of the patient's ability to pay—of consultant and specialist services (including the services of surgeons, internists, psychiatrists, obstetricians, pediatricians, dermatologists, and others, hospital and similar facilities, laboratory services, optometry services, and X-ray services. Provision is made for the addition of dental and home-nursing services as rapidly as practical. The bill is clear in requiring that the arrangements to provide the medical and related services shall be worked out so that they are mutually agreeable to the administrative officers and to those who agree to furnish the services.

The bill contains various provisions to assure that medical benefits will be of the highest quality that can be made available, will promote personal relations between doctor and patient, will emphasize prevention of disease, and will be adapted to the needs and practices of the community, in both rural and urban areas.

The Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service—a doctor—would administer the technical and professional aspects of the program. The Surgeon General would also be directed to work out the closest possible coordination between the prepaid medical and hospital services and the public health services of the Federal, State, and local governments.

The Surgeon General and the Social Security Board are directed to make studies and to report to Congress on dental, nursing, or other services not provided under the system, and on services and facilities needed for the care of the chronic sick and for persons afflicted with mental diseases.

The Surgeon General is directed, with the advice of the National Advisory Medical Policy Council, to administer grants-in-aid to nonprofit institutions and agencies engaging in research or in undergraduate or postgraduate professional education.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 301 provides for the usual separability clause.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have been very much interested in the statement of the Sena-

tor from New York about the bill which he on behalf of himself and the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has just introduced. Does the Senator's bill take care of all the people, particularly I have in mind the large group engaged in agriculture and those living in the rural districts?

Mr. WAGNER. It does.

Mr. HILL. In other words, it is all-inclusive?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; it is all-inclusive.

Mr. HILL. The provision for the prepayment of medical costs under the insurance plan would take in everybody.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as a substitute for the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	Murdock
Bali	Hart	Myers
Barkley	Hatch	O'Daniel
Blair	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Reed
Buck	Hill	Revercomb
Bushfield	Hoey	Robertson
Butler	Huffman	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Carville	Knowland	Stewart
Chavez	La Follette	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Tunnell
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Wagner
Ferguson	Maybank	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	Wheeler
George	Millikin	White
Gerry	Mitchell	Wiley
Green	Moore	Wilson
Guffey	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TERMINATION OF RATIONING OF BUTTER, OLEOMARGARINE, FATS, OILS, AND MEATS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I desire to detain the Senate for but a few moments.

On the 8th of November I submitted a resolution (S. Res. 185), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The resolution concludes with the following:

Therefore be it:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the Department of Agriculture should order the Office of Price Administration to cease rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, and oils, and meats as soon as is practicable, but in no case later than November 15, 1945.

Mr. President, the date of November 15, of course, has already passed. The

resolution, which was submitted by me, is one of the "whereas" resolutions. It includes a sort of summary of the evidence submitted and the conclusions reached by a subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee at various and sundry hearings on the meats, fats, and oil situation. I shall read the resolution. I might state at the outset that my purpose in referring to the resolution at this time is to explain the reasons for not having called it up for consideration before November 15, and further to ask that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the resolution and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because the resolution does not ask anything of the Office of Price Administration. It asks that the Department of Agriculture be directed to require OPA to cease the rationing.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator is not asking for consideration of the resolution at this time?

Mr. STEWART. No; I would not do that, of course. All I shall ask at this time is that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the resolution, and that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I may say further at the outset that I have already mentioned this matter to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who appears not to be in the Chamber at the moment though he was here a few minutes ago, and he advises me he has no objection to such a request.

The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the United States military services and other Government agencies have recently released for public consumption in the United States 100,000,000 pounds of high quality creamery butter; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture has seen fit to sell 8,000,000 pounds of creamery butter in foreign markets; and

Whereas 100,000,000 pounds of creamery butter added to current commercial stocks and expected production during November and December 1945 will provide at least 150,000,000 pounds of creamery butter for each such month; and

Whereas 150,000,000 pounds a month is more than enough to provide for all unrestricted domestic civilian consumption of high quality creamery butter during November and December and provide for an adequate year end carry-over; and

Whereas the production of butter begins to increase in December, due to seasonal factors, and continues to increase monthly for the ensuing 6 months; and

Whereas civilians will have the entire United States butter production available for their use during 1946, with the exception of very small quantities which will be purchased by the United States military services; and

Whereas oleomargarine, which is used for the same purpose, is in surplus supply; and

Whereas there will continue to be sufficient fats and oils available to produce supplies of oleomargarine equal to the demand for it; and

Whereas the current civilian allocation of other fats and oils, including lard, is at the highest rate since the initiation of fats and oils rationing; and

Whereas shortening, salad and cooking oils are being produced in quantities greater than at any time since regulations were imposed and in quantities greater than those produced prior to the war; and

Whereas the supply of raw materials needed to produce shortening, salad and cooking oils will continue to be sufficient to maintain this production; and

Whereas the production of lard, one of the chief fats and oils, will be substantially increased beginning not later than November 1, due to the seasonal increase in hog slaughter; and

Whereas the availability of supply is now sufficient to provide as much fats and oils as has ever before been consumed in this country during a peacetime period; and

Whereas the total domestic production of fats and oils, including lard, during 1946 will be available for civilian consumption, except for very small quantities which will be purchased by the United States military services; and

Whereas meat supplies in the United States at the present time are admittedly available at the annual rate of 159 pounds per capita and will continue to be available at this rate for the remainder of the year; and

Whereas meat supplies in this quantity are greater than were ever before available in the United States during any prewar period; and

Whereas meat supplies will be available during 1946 at a rate far in excess of the quantity consumed at any previous time; and

Whereas the supplies of poultry, eggs, fish, and cheese are abundant; and

Whereas the military has ceased purchasing poultry, eggs, fish, and cheese; and

Whereas the large supplies of poultry, eggs, fish, and cheese will supplement the supplies of meat available for civilian consumption in the United States; and

Whereas the continuation of rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, and oils, and meat is causing hoarding, maldistribution, and disruption of normal marketing; and

Whereas the expense of continuing rationing is no longer warranted; and

Whereas industry is capable of reestablishing normal distribution of these commodities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the Department of Agriculture should order the Office of Price Administration to cease rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, and oils, and meat as soon as is practicable, but in no case later than November 15, 1945.

First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to amend the resolution by changing the date from November 15 to December 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I correctly understand that the Senator is now submitting a new resolution?

Mr. STEWART. No, Mr. President. This is a resolution which I submitted on the 8th of this month, in which I asked for the discontinuance of rationing of the products referred to in it at a date not later than November 15, 1945. That date has now passed. That is the reason I ask to amend the resolution. It is the same resolution which I submitted on the 8th of November. As I stated, it is one of the "whereas" resolutions. The whereases constitute a summary of the evidence and conclusions reached by the Small Business Subcommittee, of which I was chairman, as a result of numerous

hearings we have held this fall on the subject.

Mr. MURDOCK. And the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Because the OPA was involved.

Mr. STEWART. I assume that was the reason.

Mr. MURDOCK. I now understand the Senator is asking unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. STEWART. I am going to propound such a request, that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the resolution and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because the resolution asks that the Department of Agriculture be required to direct the OPA to discontinue rationing. I understand that the OPA has no further control over rationing, except under the direction of the Department of Agriculture. So I believe that the resolution was improperly referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I think the Senator from Utah was in the Chamber when I stated that I had discussed this question with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and that he agreed with me that the resolution had been improperly referred. At least, he said he would have no objection to the request which I intend to propound in a moment. Before propounding the request I wish to say a word or two about the resolution.

From time to time for the past 3 or 4 months we have been holding hearings upon complaints of small packers, individuals, and others interested in industries which might be affected by any decision relating to meats, fats, oils, and so forth. A great many questions, and many phases of the problem were considered. The Senate Small Business Committee, the group which has listened to the hearings, as well as the staff of the committee, has become definitely convinced that the time for the lifting of rationing is here. We feel that there is absolutely a surplus of meat, as well as a surplus of practically all kinds of fats and oils. The only question which may arise at the moment in that connection is as to whether there is an adequate supply of lard and certain pork products. We are told, and the evidence before the committee in the last hearing, approximately 2 weeks ago, was conclusive in the opinion of the experts, that after the first of the year, or between the 1st of December and the first of the year, there will not be a shortage of pork products of any kind, because of the expected increase in the supply of hogs. The accuracy of that view is daily being demonstrated, so we are advised, since the hearing was held. Therefore I think it is but fair to the American public that the rationing of all meat products, as well as fats and oils of all kinds, including butter and oleomargarine, be completely lifted.

On one occasion we were told at the hearings that it was possible that an order to that effect would be made, lifting the rationing by the 1st of November. That was early in the fall. Now we understand that it is to be postponed until the first of the year. That is information which has come more or less indirectly from the Department of Agriculture. But certainly we have an adequate supply of every single item which is needed in the case of practically every one of the fats, oils, and meats referred to in the resolution. Very definitely we have a decided oversupply of butter, and of meat of practically every kind.

All these commodities are purchased with red rationing points. The same kind of points used to purchase a beef roast are used to purchase a pound of butter. I understand they are called red points. So all these products are in the same category. An oversupply of one balances a short supply of the other to a certain extent. We have now reached the point where we have an oversupply of practically all of them.

We learned at the hearings that the southern part of the country consumes a much larger amount per capita of fats, butter, lard, and oils than does any other section of the country. The average per capita consumption is between 48 and 50 pounds throughout the entire Nation, but in the southern part of the country, where many coal mines are located and where cotton and other crops are industriously cultivated in the hot season of the year, the people consume an average of approximately 100 pounds a person, which is about twice the national average. Naturally, therefore, this summer and fall there was a great shortage of fats and oils in the southern area of the United States, and we had considerable difficulty in having adjustments made; but fortunately after 3 or 4 weeks we were able to have sent into that section at least a temporarily adequate supply of fats and oils.

It is our belief that if rationing on fats and oils and meats can be lifted, the problem will naturally adjust itself within a reasonably short time. With a large oversupply of every one of the products mentioned in the resolution, I think it is but right and proper that the order which the resolution proposes should be issued.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has not yet returned to the Chamber. I think perhaps he is at lunch. However, he stated to me that he would have no objection to my request.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 185, and that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

A CONSTRUCTIVE WOOL POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this morning the Special Committee of

the Senate on the Production, Transportation, and Marketing of Wool began hearings which it is hoped may result in the development of a constructive wool policy by the Congress and the executive branch of the Government. At those hearings I made an opening statement to which I should like to invite the attention of Members of Congress, as well as others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I therefore ask that this statement, entitled "Wanted, a Constructive Wool Policy for the United States," be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The United States is without a wool policy. Although it is the world's best market for wool, it produces less than it consumes. Its domestic producers of wool are unable to enter the market with the slightest confidence because exporting countries which consume far less than they produce pursue a very positive policy intended to capture the American market.

The three principal exporters of wool are the British Dominions, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. Of these South Africa in the period before the war consumed practically none of its wool, New Zealand less than 3 percent, and Australia scarcely 7 percent. Among them they will have, in the postwar period, an estimated exportable surplus of 1,440,000,000 pounds, which, when added to the accumulated stocks now on hand, will mean a total surplus of almost 4,500,000,000 pounds in world trade.

During the war the consumption of wool in the United States has been doubled because we have produced here unexpectedly large amounts of both military and civilian woolsens. Imports which in 1942 amounted to 60 percent of the total amount of wool consumed by the United States mills had risen in August of this year to 88 percent. Meanwhile, there has been accumulated in the United States a stock pile of British owned wool amounting now to 286,000,000 pounds which, when added to the United Kingdom and Dominion stocks, makes a total of 3,601,000,000 pounds.

Unless a positive program is developed to stimulate the utilization of wool the prospects for consuming this tremendous surplus are not bright with consequent disadvantageous effects on the domestic producers.

The industrial plants of Germany have been practically destroyed and while it is reported that textile mills in France and Belgium have not been seriously damaged, there is little likelihood that these countries can be expected rapidly to resume even their prewar consumption. Thus the burden of wool consumption is thrown on the United States. Here, however, with the demand for military uniforms at an end, the market for wool will be measured largely by civilian consumption.

The loyalty of the British Dominions to the mother country is easily understood when one considers the leadership which the Government of the United Kingdom is providing the Dominions in planning for the disposal of their huge surpluses. Representatives of Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa met in London early this year to confer with representatives of the United Kingdom to devise a plan by which British stocks and the future clips may be sold in such manner as to protect the producer from loss. The British Government has constituted itself a highly able and successful salesman for the wool producers of its Dominions. It is the hope of American wool producers that their Government will not be less jealous of their interests than the United Kingdom is of the interests of the

producers of Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa.

It is true that during the war the Commodity Credit Corporation has from year to year purchased the domestic clip in this country at ceiling prices. This policy has been beneficial, but it has existed only on a year-to-year basis and to date there is no indication of what the future program is likely to be.

It is true also that when, at the beginning of the war, this Government undertook to permit the United Kingdom to establish a stock pile of wool in the United States it effected an agreement that the wool should not be sold in the United States until the United States and Great Britain had agreed upon the conditions of sale, one of which would be the payment of the tariff duty. This agreement has been respected, but it is one of the major objectives of British policy to dispose of the United Kingdom stock pile in this country as soon as it can be done.

Two other aspects of Government policy toward United States production are not quite so satisfactory. Ceiling prices on wool have been held down in the face of increased costs of production while, in the public-lands States, grazing authorities of both the Department of Agriculture, through the United States Forest Service, and the Department of the Interior, through the Grazing Service, have indicated a positive desire to increase the fees paid by producers for grazing upon the forest reserves and the grazing districts. The net result of this uncertain, not to say contradictory Government policy, has been an accelerating liquidation of domestic flocks. It is now estimated that the 1946 clip in the United States will not be more than 300,000,000 pounds as against a normal prewar clip of approximately 450,000,000 pounds. The numbers of breeding sheep in the United States have declined approximately 25 percent since 1942.

It is thus evident that the time has come for Congress and the executive arm of this Government to develop a constructive policy with respect to wool. We cannot be less considerate of the American producers than our British cousins are of the Dominion producers. It would seem that this is the appropriate time for the Government of the United States to announce such a policy, for the terms and conditions of an American loan to Great Britain of large proportions are now under active consideration by the representatives of the two governments.

This special Senate committee, recognizing the importance of the problem, has invited not only the representatives of Government agencies which have jurisdiction over matters affecting the wool industry, but the representatives of all branches of the domestic wool industry to assemble here to give consideration to the development of a constructive United States policy. One thing seems to be clear, namely, that in the face of a world surplus of wool our greatest need is to seek ways and means of expanding the market. It is by finding broader uses of wool, that is to say, by increased consumption, that we can best attack the disposal of the huge surplus. The British conferees who worked out the British wool program have estimated that it will take 13 years from June 30, 1945, to eliminate the present stock.

Wherever we turn we are confronted with surpluses, whether it be with respect to war facility plants built by this Government to supply the United Nations with the materials of war or agricultural commodities like wool. Heretofore we have attacked this problem by the restriction of production if not by the actual destruction of the commodities themselves and this has been done in the face of the acknowledged fact that by far the great majority of the people of the world are still unable to purchase the commodities which they need to maintain a decent standard of living. The State Department in its negotiations with foreign

countries may well consider ways and means of urging foreign governments to stimulate living standards abroad so that the United States will not be called upon to continue to absorb world surpluses to the disadvantage of American producers.

The question, however, is presented not only to Government, but also to industry, what can be done to increase the consumption? What can be done to make it possible for people here and everywhere to secure and use more of the commodities which we are so clearly capable of producing?

What can the manufacturers of woollens do to promote the use of wool and particularly what can American manufacturers do to help the American producer stabilize his market at a level that will enable him to meet the cost of production? What can the wool trade do to promote this objective? By the suggestions which are offered here before this Senate committee and the assembled representatives of Government it surely will be possible to develop an American wool policy.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the distinction between the committee amendment and the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I offered last Friday.

The committee amendment was prepared on the theory that very limited power should be given to the President, within certain well-defined channels and with a number of exceptions, to present a reorganization plan to the Congress for its action. The committee amendment also provided that after a period of 60 days, if the plan were not vetoed, by concurrent resolution of both Houses, it would become law. Objection was made to the committee amendment from two different standpoints, and it was because of those objections that I offered my amendment as a substitute, in order to meet all the objections which have been made to the committee amendment.

My substitute simply provides that the President shall submit a reorganization plan, and it limits him in no way as to the field he shall cover or the executive departments he shall include, and on the other hand, in order to make the procedure constitutional and to preserve our congressional legislative power, it provides that such a plan, in order to go into effect and to become law, must have the affirmative approval of Congress by means of a joint resolution passed by both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

That, briefly stated, is the alternate plan which, if adopted, will save us all the confusion which now has been brought about by the committee proposal with all the exceptions and amendments which have been offered and all the en-

deavors which have been made to curtail the President's initiative, and to surround him with all sorts of limitations and difficulties in proposing his program. At the same time, my substitute also obviates the constitutional objection, namely, that legislation cannot be enacted without the affirmative action of both Houses of Congress. It seems to me that if the Members of the Senate will recognize the simplicity of the substitute proposal and adopt it, it will be possible to move immediately in the direction of a worth-while reorganization plan, and bring about expeditious action upon it.

It has been suggested to me today, Mr. President, that there are two objections to my plan. One is that my proposal specifies no date before which the President shall submit his plan. If an amendment providing for a deadline when the President shall submit his plan is offered, I shall be very glad to have it included in my amendment. The other suggestion is that my substitute fails to provide a way by which the reorganization plan, after it has been submitted to the Congress by the President and has been referred to a committee, shall automatically get out of the committee, in the event it becomes buried there. I shall be very glad to have that point taken care of by providing that after a certain number of days a plan which has been referred to a committee shall automatically be returned to the Senate.

In brief, Mr. President, my amendment in the nature of a substitute provides, first, that the Congress shall approve a reorganization plan submitted by the President by regular constitutional process, involving positive legislative action taken by both Houses of Congress; and, above all, my plan will give the President a free hand to tell the Congress exactly how he believes the executive branch of Government should be reorganized. That is the difference between the committee plan and the plan I have proposed.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Does the Senator from New Jersey contend that the President does not now have the right to submit to Congress such a reorganization plan, without having the Congress take any action at this time?

Mr. SMITH. That point was raised Friday. Of course, the President does have the right to submit a reorganization plan at this time, but we all realize that over a period of years no President has done so.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator's proposal would give the President additional authority in that respect; would it?

Mr. SMITH. My substitute would call upon the President from time to time to determine whether reorganization in the executive branch of Government is necessary and, if it is found to be necessary, to submit a reorganization plan to the Congress.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes; and it would leave the country where it now is; would it not?

Mr. SMITH. No; I do not think it would leave the country where it now is,

because it calls upon the President to submit a plan to the Congress, and in title II provides special machinery whereby the House of Representatives and the Senate can expedite action on the plan, whereas under the usual procedure there would be all the ordinary delays incident to the enactment of legislation.

I am convinced that my substitute proposal will result in securing reorganization under a plan submitted by the President. Without the adoption of my proposal, I think no such reorganization would be secured.

Mr. President, I believe the yeas and nays have been ordered on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MURDOCK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	Morse
Ball	Hart	Murdoch
Barkley	Hatch	Myers
Bilbo	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Buck	Hill	Reed
Butler	Hoey	Revercomb
Byrd	Huffman	Robertson
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Carville	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Chavez	Knowland	Smith
Connally	La Follette	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Tunnell
Eastland	McFarland	Tydings
Ellender	McKellar	Vandenberg
Fulbright	McMahon	Walsh
George	Maybank	White
Gerry	Mead	Wiley
Green	Mitchell	Wilson
Guffey	Moore	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as I am compelled to attend a hearing at 2 o'clock, and may not be able to vote on the pending amendment, I wish to express briefly my views with reference to it.

I am opposed to any amendment which requires affirmative action on the part of Congress, by joint resolution or otherwise, before any reorganization ordered by the President may take effect. I would vote for an amendment which would eliminate all exemptions from the pending bill and leave the matter entirely to the President. I would do that no matter who the President might be, because I think we can trust any man who has been elected President of the United States, or who becomes President under our constitutional processes, to have the interest of the country at heart. I think that we can also trust him to have more inside information with reference to the workings of the various departments than we can have as Members of Congress.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have only a minute in which to complete what I wish to say, if the Senator will permit me to conclude my statement.

Mr. President, what I have said was without any reflection upon the Congress, because in the very nature of things the President must be more intimately associated with the departments over which he presides as Chief Executive than are we, the Members of Congress.

I feel that if the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] were agreed to it would take us right back to the original proposition that Congress should reorganize the Government. I do not believe that Congress either will or can reorganize the Government. If it had the time to devote a whole session to the subject, without being burdened by any other considerations, it might be able to perform the task. But with all the multitude of duties which burden us and which are on our doorsteps all the time, it is impossible for Congress to reorganize the departments of Government.

I was a member of a special committee on reorganization which was appointed in 1939, of which the former Senator from South Carolina, now the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, was the chairman. As a result of our hearings and our deliberations in connection with the reorganization of the Government, temporary and partial reorganization legislation was enacted. I am convinced that the only way to reorganize effectively the Government is to authorize the President, who is the head of all the departments of the Government, to do so. If he does so in a way which Congress does not approve, then Congress, by joint resolution, should have the right to disapprove. I understand that to be the proposal contained in the pending bill if the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey is not adopted. Therefore, while I would vote for an amendment offered by any Senator to eliminate all exemptions—even those contained in the House bill—from the proposed legislation, inasmuch as the pending amendment of the Senator from New Jersey is coupled with the provision that any plan for reorganization which the President may submit must be affirmatively approved by a joint resolution of the two Houses before it can become effective, I am compelled to register my opposition to it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I wish to point out to the Senator that according to the bill which he is supporting, which provides that the President may submit a plan the rejection of which would require a resolution of both Houses, the President and one House alone could put a plan into effect even if every Member of the Senate objected to it. I feel that that is unconstitutional, entirely aside from the unwise policy involved. I agree fully with the Senator that the President is the one who should propose a reorganization plan, and that is why I have eliminated, through my amendment, every restriction which might be placed upon him. He would be free to tell us what kind of a plan he wants, but I insist that after the plan has been presented it should be

within our constitutional power to say whether we will make it law.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the Senator's attitude. I do not impugn his good faith in any way. I am sure the Senator is sincere.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not troubled about any suggested inhibitions because I think Congress has the power, under the Constitution, to authorize the President, or any agency which it may designate, to work out a reorganization of the Government departments. Congress created all of those departments in a rather haphazard way. It established them one at a time, and frequently without regard to coordination. Because of that fact we now have the topsy-turvy system about which we all complain constantly and about which we apparently are not willing to authorize anyone to do anything unless we reserve to ourselves the right to undo it by affirmative legislation. I do not believe in that method.

Mr. SMITH. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield, but I shall have to leave the Chamber very shortly.

Mr. SMITH. Is the Senator willing to accept the bill in the form in which it was reported by the committee, providing that if either House objects within the prescribed period—

Mr. BARKLEY. No; personally I would not accept it because I do not think we can legislate by a single House of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SMITH. But we are legislating by a single House when we allow one House and the President to put into effect a plan.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; we are not legislating in that way. We are providing that once the President prepares a reorganization plan and submits it to Congress, unless Congress by appropriate legislation—and that means the action of both Houses—shall disapprove it, the plan shall go into effect.

Mr. SMITH. I am sorry to disagree with the distinguished Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the logical constitutional method by which the Congress can declare its attitude with respect to the matter.

Mr. President, I am sorry that I am now compelled to leave.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as a substitute for the committee amendment as amended. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. SALTONSTALL's name was called). I announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] because of a temporary and slight illness. I am authorized to say that if present he would vote "yea" on the pending amendment.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BUTLER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. Not knowing how he would

vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and vote "yea."

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and vote "yea."

Mr. REED (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who was in the Chamber a while ago, and I assumed he was still here. I see he is not now present. I therefore transfer the pair which I have with him to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on official business at Government departments.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is a delegate to the American Legion convention in Chicago, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused until November 20 for reasons heretofore stated.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are detained at a meeting of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are members of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho. The Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "yea" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—25

Austin	Hickenlooper	Smith
Ball	Knowland	Taft
Bridges	La Follette	Tydings
Butler	Moore	Vandenberg
Capper	Morse	White
Cordon	Reed	Wiley
Donnell	Revercomb	Wilson
Gurney	Robertson	
Hart	Shipstead	

NAYS—40

Barkley	Guffey	Maybank
Bilbo	Hatch	Mead
Buck	Hayden	Mitchell
Byrd	Hill	Murdock
Carville	Hoey	Myers
Chavez	Huffman	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Downey	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Eastland	Lucas	Taylor
Ellender	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McClellan	Tunnell
George	McFarland	Walsh
Gerry	McKellar	
Green	McMahon	

NOT VOTING—29

Aiken	Glass	Saltonstall
Andrews	Hawkes	Stewart
Bailey	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Bankhead	Langer	Tobey
Brewster	Magnuson	Wagner
Briggs	Millikin	Wheeler
Brooks	Murray	Wherry
Bushfield	O'Daniel	Willis
Capehart	Overton	Young
Ferguson	Pepper	

So Mr. SMITH's amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the committee, as amended, was rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MITCHELL in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, in line 12, it is proposed to strike out "is hereby repealed", and insert "is hereby amended by striking out the words 'upon the termination of this title' and inserting the words 'on July 1, 1947.'"

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer this amendment in behalf of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] who is unable to be present.

On the 18th page of the bill appears this cryptic sentence:

SEC. 8. The second paragraph of section 5 of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941 (55 Stat. 838), being the last sentence of the said title I, is hereby repealed.

Turning to the First War Powers Act, we find that we gave the President power to reorganize departments, with some limitations, without any reference to Congress whatsoever. The President

has exercised that power throughout the war. Under the First War Powers Act it is provided that at the expiration of war all the departments in which changes have been made shall go back to the condition in which they were before the war.

The effect of the proposed section 8 is to provide that the changes made shall continue forever, although never submitted to the Congress. The effect of my amendment is to provide that they shall continue until July 1, 1947, the last date upon which the President may act under the proposed law. In other words, he will have full opportunity to submit a reorganization plan making the changes permanent if he wishes to do so, and then Congress will have a chance to veto the plan if it desires to do so.

Mr. President, it seems to me this is a reasonable way in which to handle the matter. Many of the changes in the Government set-up were made solely for war purposes. We granted the President the power only with the idea that they should be made for war purposes. It seems to me that now it is proper for us to say that the President may make the changes permanent, under the proposed reorganization law, if he wishes to do so, but if he does not do so by the 1st of July 1947, when his powers under the proposed law will expire, the departments shall revert to their prewar status.

I hope the Senator in charge of the bill may feel that this is a reasonable method of handling the situation. It seems to me we did not intend to make the war changes permanent changes in the Government.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, it seems to me the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is strictly in line with the philosophy of the bill. I agree that the changes in organization of the executive departments which have been made under the First War Powers Act would become permanent, under the language of the bill, without ever being referred back to the Congress. Under the amendment now offered by the Senator from Ohio proposed changes would be referred back to the Congress, and the time would be identical with the time provided in the pending bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wanted to ask the Senator from Utah if it is not correct to say that there was no intention in the committee to take affirmative action to make these war agencies permanent. There was the intention to bring them within the general reorganization plan. Is that correct?

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. HATCH. And there is then no conflict between the intention of the committee and the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. I can find no objection at all to the amendment and, so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to have it go to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment, as amended, is open to further amendment.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and for myself I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, beginning on page 19, line 15, it is proposed to strike out all down to the end of the bill and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 203. A resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be. The committee shall have 10 days in which to consider and report out the resolution. If the resolution is not reported out by the committee within such 10 days, the committee shall be deemed to have been discharged from the further consideration of the resolution. On the eleventh day after the referral to the committee of the resolution, it shall become the special order with precedence over any unfinished business. Not later than 1 hour after the House in which such resolution is pending meets on the first day on which it meets following the nineteenth day (Sundays excepted) after the day on which the resolution was introduced, a vote shall be taken in that House on the question of the adoption of the resolution. The resolution shall be debatable up to the time specified above for the taking of the vote, and the time shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No notice or motion to reconsider any vote upon the resolution shall be in order. The procedure provided by this section shall not be applicable with respect to a second resolution relating to the same reorganization plan. In any case in which two or more resolutions with respect to the same reorganization plan are introduced in the same House on the same day, only one resolution with respect to such reorganization plan shall be deemed to have been introduced in that House on that day and such one resolution shall be considered to have been introduced jointly by the sponsors of the separate resolutions relating to such reorganization plan.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, just a word respecting this substitute in title II covering procedure. Briefly stated, if the veto resolution is sent to a committee, the amendment simply makes it automatic that the resolution shall come back to the Senate floor, so that it cannot be buried in committee. The danger in this type of legislation is that a resolution may be buried in committee, and the President's reorganization plan may become law without action by either House. The resolution at least should come back to the floor without having to be voted out of committee. The amendment simply deals with a question of procedure, which the Senator from Michigan and I thought should be embodied in negative legislation of this type. If the President presents a plan, then within 60 days after the plan is presented it goes into effect should there be no action by either House. The danger is that the plan might be buried in committee with no chance for either House to vote. The amendment deals with the question of

procedure. It would simply bring the resolution back on the floor automatically. That is what we are proposing by the amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, while the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] contains automatic features, and may in some respects be preferable to the procedure provided for in the bill, it is my opinion that the amendment has not been thoroughly thought out, and it is subject in my humble opinion to considerable criticism from that angle.

I point out one thing in particular. Let us suppose that at the expiration of the 10 days the resolution automatically comes from the committee. The amendment provides that it shall then become the pending business before the House or Senate and shall be debatable for 10 days. The 10-day period is to be divided, as I understand, equally between the opposing parties. But there is nothing in the amendment at all that would preclude extraneous debate entering into the picture and excluding entirely debate on the resolution which would be before the Senate. The present method of procedure was worked out in the 1939 act, and has been found to operate quite efficiently, and the House has agreed to it. It does much less violence to the rules of the two Houses than the proposed amendment, and in my opinion it would be a mistake for the Senate hurriedly to adopt the amendment instead of adopting the language of the pending bill. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment, as amended, is open to further amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Utah a question, and at the same time to compliment him on the very able way in which he has handled the pending legislation. I ask the Senator to turn to the bottom of page 11. Section 2 on page 10 provides:

No reorganization plan under section 4 shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

Then at the bottom of page 11—

(h) divesting any quasi-judicial agency of the means, right, or power to exercise independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the performance and effectuation of its quasi-judicial, investigative, or rule-making functions; or

And at the top of page 12:

(i) increasing the term of any office beyond that now provided by law for such office.

I was wondering if the Senator could tell us what changes that language would effect. It seems to me that is a more or less wholesale exemption of any agencies that perform quasi-judicial functions, or

are engaged in investigative or rule-making functions, which is, as I see it, a very broad latitude.

Mr. MURDOCK. The thought of the Senate committee, I may inform the Senator, was that any quasi-judicial agency in exercising quasi-judicial functions or rule-making functions should be absolutely independent of, say, a Cabinet officer. The purpose of the committee was that in the event a quasi-judicial agency which is now independent should be placed under a Cabinet officer, notwithstanding that fact the Cabinet officer should in no way interfere with the absolute independence of the quasi-judicial functions or the rule-making functions of such agency.

Mr. President, if subparagraph (h) of section 2 is left in the bill I believe there is a possibility in conference to make the language more definitive, to restrict its meaning, so that it will not have the broad scope it has now, and that we may be able to rewrite subparagraph (h) in such a way that some of the exemptions, or many of them, may be eliminated from the bill, and that full protection may be afforded under the language that may be developed in conference.

Mr. BYRD. Is it the interpretation of the Senator, then, that any agency engaged in quasi-judicial investigative or rule-making functions is exempted from the bill?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I do not think that is a fair construction of the language. It may be well to read it.

Mr. BYRD. It seems to me that the provision could be couched in more appropriate language. It seems to me to be ambiguous.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let us take the Department of Agriculture. We find in that Department the Forest Service, which certainly could be defined under this language as a quasi-judicial agency. In the Department of the Interior we find the General Land Office, which is constantly rendering quasi-judicial decisions respecting land matters.

Mr. BYRD. Suppose the President wanted to recommend the abolition of an office. Let us take the OPA. That is certainly a quasi-judicial agency in the making of all kinds of decisions. The language is:

Divesting any quasi-judicial agency.

If the OPA is abolished it would certainly be divested of the right of doing these things.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the abolition of an agency would not be precluded by this language.

Mr. BYRD. Could not the Senator, who is a very able lawyer—

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Draft a provision which would be clearer? I hesitate to vote for the bill if there is a possibility that that provision would exempt a great number of agencies, because nearly all the agencies of the Government make rules and regulations and have the power of investigation, and so forth. I have a list of such agencies given to me by the Bureau of the Budget. It construes the language to mean that quite a number of agencies would be exempted from the bill if passed in its present form.

Mr. MURDOCK. I doubt that the language is sufficient to exempt an agency. The whole purpose of it is to protect an agency in its independence of functions, so far as quasi-judicial functions and rule making are concerned.

Mr. BYRD. I have no desire to protect these bureaus in the matter of authority which they have frequently usurped and taken to themselves with respect to making rules and regulations. That is something in which there has been a great abuse. I do not want to disturb the Senator by offering an amendment, but I do think there ought to be some way to clarify that provision.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the Senator from Virginia that the language is now too broad in scope, and I am hopeful of improving and correcting it in conference; but I may say to him that I am not ready at this time intelligently to deal with the question.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to comment briefly on the amendment, because the question arose at a time when I was present in the subcommittee. It was explained by the chairman of the committee [Mr. MCCARRAN] in this way, as I recall it—and I am sure that this is the interpretation which I obtained at the time as to what was intended by the amendment.

First of all, it was not intended to curtail to any degree whatever the President's power to reorganize the agencies as contemplated by the bill. He could abolish functions and make the reorganization just the same as though the amendment were not in the law. But it was intended that with respect to any such agencies as remained which exercised discretion and judgment, there should be nothing in the plan which would permit any interference with the independent exercise of the discretion and judgment vested in them by law. Frankly, I do not see how a reorganization plan could contain such a thing.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico is satisfied with the provision. I am not a member of the committee, and did not hear the argument, but it seems to me that there is a loophole by which many agencies might claim exemption from the Reorganization Act.

Mr. HATCH. I was satisfied with the explanation.

Mr. BYRD. But the explanation is not in the bill. We are voting on certain specified language. The Senator is an able lawyer, and I should like to have him read it and see whether he thinks it exempts quite a number of agencies which are now performing various quasi-judicial, investigative, or rule-making functions.

Mr. HATCH. I do not think it exempts them, but I say that if there is any doubt whatever, I join with the Senator from Utah in saying that the language should be clarified, and it should be made certain that it is not intended as an exemption of all agencies.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Utah and the Senator from New Mexico are

taking a great interest in this subject. Apparently they are satisfied that the language can be changed in conference so as to make it do what it is intended to do.

Mr. HATCH. I am sure it can.

Mr. MURDOCK. I feel that it can.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from Dallas, Tex., signed by several bankers. I should like to read it. It is as follows:

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator From Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

It has been called to our attention that the President under the bill which has just passed the House would have the power to abolish the Comptroller's office. This in our opinion would be a very serious mistake. It would place the examination of banks under the Federal Reserve Banking System which would place that institution in a dual position. In a crisis who would they protect, the Federal or the public? The Comptroller's office does not cost the Government anything. The expenses are paid by the banks of this Nation. The Comptroller's office is the only independent agency to which the banks of the country can turn for advice. We hope that when this bill is presented to the Senate that you will so amend it that the President will not have the power to place the banking system of this Nation into politics or destroy the only avenue of the country banks of this Nation. The Comptroller's office reports only to the President of the United States, therefore it is the only independent agency now in force open to the country banks of this Nation.

NATHAN ADAMS.
J. B. ADOUE, JR.
FRED F. FLORENCE.
P. B. GARRETT.
DE WITT T. RAY.
J. C. TENISON.
R. L. THORNTON.

Mr. President, I should like to see the reorganization bill go to the President with no exemptions whatever, permitting the President to reorganize the executive branch of the Government and submit his reorganization plan to both Houses of Congress for ratification, or rejection. But inasmuch as the bill now contains exemptions for 13 or 14 different agencies, and inasmuch as these bankers in Dallas, Tex., seem worried about the authority granted by the bill to abolish the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency, unless I can have some assurance from those who are handling the bill that the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency is not to be abolished in the reorganization, I should like to include that agency in the exemptions.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, does the Senator propound the question to me?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I propound the question to the able Senator from Utah as to whether or not, in his opinion, there is any possibility of abolishing the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency.

Mr. MURDOCK. Of course, the Senator from Utah is not in a position to say what the President of the United States may do. But, in my opinion, the President of the United States, coming from a small town himself, is going to guard just as jealously as any Senator or any Member of the House against anything

that would interfere with our country banks.

We have in the Government today the Federal Reserve System, handling banks. We have the Comptroller of the Currency handling certain functions in connection with our banks. We have the Treasury Department handling certain other functions, and we have the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation handling still other functions. It is my opinion that, if there is any part of our Government which needs looking into for the purpose of coordination and reorganization, it is the agencies which handle our banking system. A representative of the FDIC, in the person of Mr. Crowley, appeared before our committee and made the same plea. He said, "If you do not exempt us, you will destroy the small banks of the country." Now we have the same argument used with respect to the Comptroller of the Currency. It is all done in behalf of the small banks.

I come from a small town and all I know about banks is what I know about country banks. Certainly I do not wish to do anything which would in any way interfere with or imperil those banks. I am satisfied that the President of the United States does not wish to injure them in any way. So my answer to the Senator is that, even without exempting the Comptroller of the Currency, we can rest assured that nothing will happen under the present Chief Executive which will in any way be injurious to the country banks. I hope that the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency will not be exempted. It is my opinion that there is plenty of room for coordination and reorganization in the agencies which handle our banks. But if we eliminate all of them, we go down the road with five different agencies of the Government, all handling banks, all of which, except the Federal Reserve System, would be exempt so far as the reorganization bill is concerned.

Mr. O'DANIEL. As I understand, the Comptroller of the Currency handles not only the small banks of the Nation but audits the larger banks, the national banks.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true, but I understood that the Senator's argument came from those speaking on behalf of the smaller banks.

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; they are speaking for the larger banks of the Nation. They do not desire a consolidation of governmental agencies when their interests are opposed to it. The Federal Reserve System is one agency. The Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency is an entire different agency, which audits the national banks of the Nation. It would be a serious thing, as they view it, if the auditing of the records of national banks were taken away from this independent agency in the Treasury Department and placed in the Federal Reserve System. The bill as now written would make that possible. The President could do it, and in all good conscience he might think it was the thing to do. So these bankers are worried.

Mr. MURDOCK. The bankers appeared before our committee. Mr. Crowley appeared in behalf of the FDIC. As a

matter of the utmost caution the committee saw fit to exempt the FDIC; but it was my opinion that the argument made for the FDIC was a much better one than could be made for the exemption of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency. It is my opinion that in any reorganization or coordination of agencies dealing with the banks we should not exempt all those agencies and permit them to go down the road just as they are today.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am compelled to leave the Chamber to attend a committee meeting in a few moments.

Something which was said by the Senator from Utah impels me to leave this comment on the Record: The Senator from Utah has just stated that he thinks there is a better argument for exempting the FDIC than for exempting the other fiscal instrumentalities. I agree with him, and urge that no matter what happens, the FDIC should retain its exemption. I feel that even though no other bureau or agency were exempted, the FDIC ought to be exempted at the present time. In the final analysis, that is the steel beam underneath the popular confidence in our banking system. There is no doubt in the world that it was the FDIC which made it possible for us to sail through the past 10 difficult years without serious banking trouble. The American people are sleeping at nights in regard to their banks. Why? Primarily and fundamentally because of the FDIC.

Mr. President, I think it would be a tragic error to allow anything to be done with the FDIC which might even involve a discussion of what was going on in respect to a change in its set-up. We all know that it has been magnificently operated. It has been brought to the point where it has assets approximating \$1,000,000,000. It is economically managed. There is no necessity to worry about it from a reorganization standpoint; but fundamentally there would be reason to worry about any invitation to the American people to begin suspecting that anyone was starting to change in some fashion the set-up of the FDIC.

I thank the Senator from Texas for permitting me to make this suggestion. I hope that in the course of the discussion of the fiscal agencies and reorganization no one for an instant will think of even approaching a suggestion that the exemption of the FDIC shall not be maintained.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me for a moment?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to make a brief reply to the Senator from Michigan. I have known of the distinguished Senator's intense interest in the FDIC ever since I came to the Senate. I wish to say now that there is nothing which the Democratic administration, of which I have been a member, has done that I am prouder of than the enactment of legislation relating to our banks. As the Senator has stated, I think the out-

standing achievement in banking legislation has been the creation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. As the Senator has so eloquently stated, under the FDIC system the people are not worrying any more about the possibility of bank failures. So far as I recall, in the committee there was no opposition to having the FDIC exempted.

However, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve System, and the Treasury all have a hand in the examination and control of our banking system, and it seems to me we should not absolutely tie the President's hands in dealing with that situation. When we have exempted the FDIC, I think we have gone far enough.

Therefore, I hope the Senator from Texas will not offer his amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I also must leave the Chamber, in order to attend a committee meeting. I have asked the Senator to yield to me because I also have received messages and telegrams concerning the exemption of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency. In one of the messages the Senator from Texas read there was a statement similar to one contained in a message I have received, namely, that this bill in itself does not transfer the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency to the Federal Reserve System. The idea seems to prevail generally throughout the country that the bill itself will make that change. I arise now merely to state for the RECORD that there is nothing in the bill which will make any change in regard to the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency. So far as I know, it may or may not be that some persons think that Bureau should be under the Federal Reserve System; but I am quite sure that nothing in the bill would require such a change.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Of course, Mr. President, the measure under consideration certainly gives the President of the United States the authority to abolish the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency. In the opinion of the bankers who have telegraphed me and in the opinion of other bankers, the abolition of that Bureau would indeed be a calamity. If the national banks of the country were placed entirely under the jurisdiction of the Federal Reserve System, there would be no checks or balances; it would all be the Federal Reserve System.

I am wholly in accord with the statements which have been made here by the able and distinguished Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Utah regarding the exclusion of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. If any agencies are excluded I think it is wise to exclude that agency from the reorganization plan, because it has certainly performed a worthwhile function in assuring the small depositors that their deposits are safe. But that assurance applies only to deposits of \$5,000 or less. There is no guaranty by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for deposits of more than \$5,000. Many de-

positors have deposits exceeding \$5,000, and they must be able to have confidence in someone or some agency with reference to the security of those larger accounts. They place that confidence in the national banks which hold their deposits. The national banks have a very good reputation. While they do not actually guarantee deposits in excess of \$5,000, their standing is such that in large measure they occupy the same position as that of the FDIC in guaranteeing the smaller deposits. I repeat, the people have confidence in the national banks of this country, and that confidence may be shaken if the Bureau of Comptroller of the Currency is abolished, and its duties of checking the national banks transferred to the Federal Reserve System.

Today there is some discussion relative to consolidating the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency with the Federal Reserve System. The bankers to whom I have referred think that would be a calamity, and therefore they have telegraphed me stating their reasons for urging the retention of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency as an independent agency. Their position is that unless assurance can be given that the Bureau of Comptroller of the Currency will not be abolished by the reorganization plan, and amendment prohibiting the abolishment of that agency should be offered.

Inasmuch as I am unable to obtain such assurance I offer an amendment prohibiting the abolition of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency, and I send the amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, in line 20, after the comma, it is proposed to insert:

Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed to the committee amendment, the question is on agreeing to the committee as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I now move that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 4129.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I now move that all after the enacting clause of House bill 4129 be stricken out, and that the committee amendment, as amended, of Senate bill 1120 be substituted therefor.

The motion was agreed to.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. CORDON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hart	O'Daniel
Ball	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hayden	Reed
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bridges	Hill	Robertson
Buck	Hoey	Russell
Bushfield	Huffman	Shipstead
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Capper	Knowland	Taft
Carville	La Follette	Taylor
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McCarran	Tobey
Cordon	McClellan	Tunnell
Dcnnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Wagner
Ellender	Maybank	Walsh
Ferguson	Mead	Wheeler
Fulbright	Millikin	White
George	Mitchell	Wiley
Gerry	Moore	Wilson
Green	Morse	Young
Guffey	Murdock	
Gurney	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 4129) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. REVERCOMB conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill (S. 1120) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, will be indefinitely postponed.

PRINTING OF MANUSCRIPT RELATING TO INCOME TAX LAWS OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES OF WORLD WAR II

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MITCHELL in the chair) laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 102, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers Explanatory of the Federal Income Tax Law With Respect to Members of the Armed Forces of the United States in World War II" be printed with illustrations, as a public document, and that 12,000 additional copies shall be printed, of which 10,000 shall be for the House document room and 2,000 for the Senate document room.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution of the House.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator indicate just exactly what this is?

Mr. HAYDEN. The concurrent resolution authorizes the printing of a public document providing information for veterans with respect to income tax laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

**LABOR-MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS—
STATEMENT BY NATIONAL CATHOLIC
WELFARE COUNCIL**

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on November 18 a release covering the subject of labor-management problems was made public by the Most Reverend Karl J. Alter, Bishop of Toledo, chairman of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Council.

I look with favor upon suggestions of this character which have to do with the development of advanced ideas in the field of labor-management relations. Because of the importance of this news release, and because of the originality of the suggestions which it contains, I should like to have it made part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I wish to point out particularly two paragraphs which I think are very interesting. I read from the statement:

The suggestion grows out of two facts that hinder the settlement of labor disputes. One is the danger that if strikes of great magnitude occur, laws enforcing compulsory arbitration may ensue. That would be tragic. Voluntary arbitration is good, but compulsory arbitration is a long leap down the totalitarian road and is no help toward the proper settlement of disputes on either side. It will, in fact, not be accepted so long as the working people and the employers are Americans and believe in their dignity as sons of God.

The statement says further:

Our proposal is a modest one but one of far-reaching importance. It is that a method of fact-finding be set up to reinforce conciliation, arbitration, collective bargaining, and the attitude of the public toward any important labor dispute; * * * These boards would make the facts known. They would make no decision as to the dispute. They would present the facts to fortify the right side in a dispute.

Mr. President, this suggestion is built around the possibility of setting up fact-finding boards which would not be directly associated with the conciliation or the arbitration or the collective bargaining agency, but would be independent, separate, and distinct, and would bring out the facts after consultation with both sides to the dispute, or all sides to the dispute, and make the facts available to those who have to do with the work of arbitrating or mediating or conciliating disputes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was interested in the remarks of the Senator from New York about compulsory arbitration. From what study I have given the subject, compulsory arbitration is something which theoretically is very appealing, but as a practical solution would not be workable, for the very reason the Senator has mentioned, namely, it would

start a dictatorship if we compelled men on the one hand or industry on the other to do something which they thought would in the end bring ruin on either. I have come to the conclusion that, in spite of the appeal of compulsory arbitration, I do not believe forcible settlement can be achieved without potential liabilities which far outweigh any temporary advantages if that policy should be promulgated and continued.

However, there is one phase of the present labor difficulties about which I should like to see something constructive done. I do not know that I am accurate in my facts, but one gains the impression that when labor and management, through collective bargaining, enter into a contract, and management then breaks the contract, labor has the right to strike, and no one would want to take that right away from labor. On the other hand, if labor breaks its contract and refuses to work, so to speak, under the terms of a collective-bargaining agreement, there does not seem to be any redress for the owner of the plant, or the management. Has the Senator given any thought to that phase of the present difficulties?

Mr. MEAD. It is my opinion, which is substantiated by reports which are drifting into the public press, that that is one of the questions now being considered.

Of course, in all contractual obligations we naturally subscribe to the theory that, once a contract is made, it should be carried out by both parties; but there are many provisions in contracts which subject themselves to multitudinous interpretations, such as cost-of-living requirements, and failure on the part of the contractor to secure sufficient orders to keep his employees together.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think there is reasonable ground for difference of opinion, but let us suppose there are a thousand men in a plant, and, for the purposes of the illustration, let us suppose it is a closed shop, and that through collective bargaining a contract is entered into. Let us suppose that 200 men go on a strike unauthorized by the union, in other words, the union itself or its officials do not authorize the strike, but, so far as the company is concerned, the 200 men being in key positions, by striking have perhaps paralyzed the whole plant.

I think that in a case such as the one I have suggested, or one related to it, management is entitled to more protection than the present law gives it. I have noticed something along this line leaking out from the conference now taking place. Certainly if management were to declare a lock-out in violation of a contract it would be held up to censure, and properly so.

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. If 200 men who have agreed not to strike because conditions are satisfactory go out on a strike, unless the union orders it, it seems to me management reciprocally should be entitled, in such a case, to some redress. There is a void in the law, so far as that phase of labor-management relations is

concerned. Does the Senator agree with me generally?

Mr. MEAD. I think generally the Senator's statement is correct, but he must remember that there are probably many difficulties which result in injustice to the workers, which have been perpetrated upon them by certain elements of the management class. For instance, it was my obligation to make an investigation of production in the automotive trade, and while on the surface it appeared that the workers were either slowing up or holding up war production, many acts of management could be advanced as reasons behind the work stoppage or slowing up. There are a thousand and one ramifications, but they are generally based upon the ideal condition the Senator presents. Throughout the war it was demonstrated in many cases that the labor leadership of the country came to the support of management in breaking so-called outlaw strikes, and in maintaining proper contractual relations.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator, and it is not an easy situation to handle. My point refers to cases where there is the right of collective bargaining, and management and labor enter into an agreement, and the union, which is the bargaining agent, does not consider the point raised, whatever the dispute may be, sufficient to warrant calling a strike or a real violation of the contract, and therefore it does not order a strike, but, nevertheless, a substantial number of employees strike anyway, indulging in what labor and management have frequently called wildcat strikes, and management stands helpless, even though the labor unions are cooperating with it trying to get the men back into the plant.

I do not believe it is fair to leave the situation in that shape. I have no solution to suggest, but I am hopeful that the present conference will devise one, because it has seemed to me that a case like that presents one of the justifiable complaints which management has had, namely, that if they enter into a contract with a union in good faith, make a hard and fast contract, and the union itself feels satisfied as a whole that the conditions are good, no group should be allowed to break a contract which was entered into for that group's protection.

Mr. MEAD. As I said before, we have had excellent demonstrations of the patriotic efforts of labor leaders to suppress outlaw strikes, such as the Senator has mentioned, especially during the war period. We also have information that this subject is now receiving attention by the labor-management conference. I am sure we are both concerned that no legislation shall be enacted which will in any way deny to the individual the economic freedom which should go with citizenship. That is, we cannot force an individual to sell his labor against his free will. Solution of the problem is difficult, but it occurs to me that by setting up a fact-finding board, such as that recommended in the press release of the National Catholic Welfare Council, there may be the possibility of an avenue of approach so that when the facts are developed, and are made known to both sides and to the public, the number of

strikes which do not carry with them the support of public opinion may be reduced to a minimum.

Mr. President, I will say that I really believe this is one of the most important domestic problems in our democracy, and I am glad to see that colleges and universities are taking up the subject and are organizing schools on management-labor relationships. I think it will result in a great deal of good. The Senator from Maryland will probably recall a recent utterance by Mr. Tobin, the president of the teamsters' union, in which he called attention to the fact that as a rule labor loses tremendously by strikes, except when it is absolutely necessary that they gain recognition, and thus, as sometimes happens, become able to eliminate a serious injustice that could only be eliminated by strikes.

I point out that it would be much better if these gains could be acquired without the economic losses which are sustained by the workers as a result of long-drawn-out strikes. So labor along with management is looking for the opportunity to settle difficulties in a more orderly manner than has been invoked in many cases in the past.

I think so highly of the statement because of the fact that it brings a new element of thought into the consideration of this problem, that I now ask to have it made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, November 18, 1945.

The following letter was sent today to the Honorable Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor and to Judge Walter P. Stacy, chairman, Labor-Management Conference:

"The Department of Social Action of the National Catholic Welfare Conference wishes to make a suggestion to the Department of Labor of the United States and to the Labor-Management Conference.

"The suggestion grows out of two facts that hinder the settlement of labor disputes. One is the danger that if strikes of great magnitude occur, laws enforcing compulsory arbitration may ensue. That would be tragic. Voluntary arbitration is good, but compulsory arbitration is a long leap down the totalitarian road and is no help toward the proper settlement of disputes on either side. It will, in fact, not be accepted so long as the working people and the employers are Americans and believe in their dignity as sons of God.

"The other fact is that methods of conciliation and voluntary arbitration often lack that thorough knowledge of the facts underlying the disputes which normally is necessary for a just agreement or a just decision.

"Our proposal is a modest one but one of far-reaching importance. It is that a method of fact finding be set up to reinforce conciliation, arbitration, collective bargaining, and the attitude of the public toward any important labor dispute; that the fact finding be in the hands of a board representative of neither side of the dispute but representative of, as far as possible, impartial members of the public; that the President of the United States or the Secretary of Labor appoint them; that as many boards, national, regional, or local, be set up as are required to aid in the settlement of major disputes; that these fact-finding bodies be instructed to report quickly; and that they receive statements from both sides in the dispute and from other competent witnesses; and have available all the pertinent knowledge which the Federal or State governments possess.

These boards would make the facts known. They would make no decision as to the dispute. They would present the facts to fortify the right side in a dispute.

"Threats of major strikes now loom. Other strikes seem to be in the offing. Others will occur after this present period ends. We recommend this fact-finding procedure both for current disputes and for the future. The facts will furnish ground for just agreements in collective bargaining and just decisions in arbitration.

"We consider this proposal both as a way to help settle current disputes and as a permanent policy of the American Government and the governments of the States. We do not contemplate this procedure except in important cases.

"The usefulness of these boards depends upon their being established early in a dispute and upon the speed of their action. Delayed statements of fact would be calamitous.

"We think that there are enough honest and capable persons in our country to man these boards in the interest of the general good.

"Sincerely yours,

"KARL J. ALTER,
"Chairman, Social Action Department,
"N. C. W. C., Bishop of Toledo."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think I am in general agreement with the philosophy of the Senator from New York on this particular matter, and likewise I have looked with a great deal of approval upon the recent statements of President Truman that one of the most dangerous things that could ever happen to labor would be for the Nation to have what might be called a national wage policy under which everyone's wages more or less would be fixed arbitrarily by the Federal Government. That might in the beginning appeal to labor, but in the end it would simply mean that jurisdiction would be taken of the whole field of wages, and if we ever adopt such a policy labor could not strike without striking against the law, and the law would be there until repealed. So when individuals are appealing to the administration that it fix a particular wage standard, so-called, they are giving hostages to fortune on the road to dictatorship, for the same reason the Senator advanced when he said that compulsory arbitration would also lead in that direction.

I am glad that the administration has not fallen into that error, because in my opinion labor eventually would be hurt more than anyone else if such a policy were carried into effect.

Mr. MEAD. If we set up the machinery for the settlement of disputes, if we give to the participants all the information and all the knowledge necessary for the effective settlement of disputes, and then if we maintain in this democratic country of ours real democracy in the settlement of industrial disputes based upon the freedom of the worker, I believe we will become the outstanding example to the industrial nations of the world.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSION ACT, 1946

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4407, reducing certain

appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes. I will state that I make the motion for the purpose of having the bill become the unfinished business, and not with an expectation that it will be taken up this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent further, as is customary in connection with a bill of this kind, that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL PARK IN PHILADELPHIA

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 674, House bill 2851, to provide for investigating the matter of the establishment of a national park in the old part of the City of Philadelphia, for the purpose of conserving the historical objects and buildings therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2851) to provide for investigating the matter of the establishment of a national park in the old part of the city of Philadelphia, for the purpose of conserving the historical objects and buildings therein.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I have conferred with certain minority members of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and as the result of the conference I beg leave to state that there is no objection offered on this side of the Chamber to immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2851), which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 6, line 6, after the word "compensation", to strike out "without regard to" and to insert "in accordance with the provisions of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 7, after the word "laws", to strike out "or", and insert "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 18, after the word "act", to strike out "Any appropriations for the National Park Service not exceeding \$25,000 and moneys which may be donated for the purposes of this act shall

be available for the necessary expenses of such investigation", and insert "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$15,000 to carry out the provisions of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

INCREASE OF PAY OF MEN IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, some weeks ago I offered on the floor of the Senate a measure seeking to increase the pay of the men in the armed services. It was voted down by a disappointingly large vote. I based my argument in part for the necessity of such an increase upon the obvious fact that it would increase voluntary enlistments. I think that everything which has transpired in connection with Army service since that date has verified the soundness of my amendment. Those who are opposed to a volunteer army do not want to increase the pay of our soldiers. I repeat today, Mr. President, that I do not think we are going to be able to raise by way of voluntary enlistment the Army which we need to do the police job that is needed to be done in various parts of the world unless we correct the pay injustice that men wearing the uniform of the United States Army today are suffering. Not only are the soldiers suffering a wage injustice but their families are suffering as the result of not being allowed adequate allotments to take care of those families while the men are in the service. I have many letters from wives and parents of servicemen describing the great hardships that are resulting from the pittance now allowed many needy cases.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I remember when the Senator made his proposal, but the amount of increase provided for is not in my mind.

Mr. MORSE. At that particular time I suggested that in order to show our good faith in the matter we propose a token increase of \$25 per month, with the understanding that we would take the matter under advisement and investigation and determine how much more ought to be allowed in order to give these men a fair day's pay for a fair day's work which they are performing for the people of the United States while serving in the Army during the postwar period.

Mr. STEWART. That would be a total of about \$75 a month for the average GI?

Mr. MORSE. Plus the subsistence allowances he receives.

Mr. STEWART. That means the base pay. The base pay today is \$50.

Mr. MORSE. It would be \$75 under my proposed amendment.

Mr. STEWART. Did the Senator ask for an increase in subsistence pay for the family of the GI?

Mr. MORSE. Not in that particular amendment, although the RECORD will show that I spoke in behalf of the need of such a thing being done in connection with the study which I proposed with regard to the whole question of servicemen's pay.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator's amendment refers to new enlistees, or those who would remain in the Regular Army.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator contemplate the payment of more money to those who would serve overseas during the period of occupation than to those who would serve in this country during that time?

Mr. MORSE. I am satisfied that the committee which would investigate the matter would find upon a careful analysis of the facts that it should bring back just such a recommendation—that there should be an extra increase in pay for the man himself while serving overseas.

Mr. STEWART. In the main I am inclined to be in sympathy with the Senator's amendment. I think we ought to do all we can to encourage volunteers in this particular period. The more we do along that line the nearer we can come to settling the problem of further drafting of young boys.

Mr. MORSE. The reason I make any comment at all on the subject today is that the same argument was made at the time I offered my amendment for increasing soldiers' pay that is usually made in the Congress of the United States when the Congress wishes to do something inadequate as of the moment, and yet put off final determination of the merits of the basic issue involved in a proposal until a later date. The usual argument was made that the subject ought to be taken under consideration, and that more time ought to be devoted to it than could be devoted by the Senate on the day when I proposed the amendment for the immediate consideration of this body.

Such inquiry as I have been able to make leads me to make the statement that nothing has been done by any committee of the Senate since the matter was under discussion, and I am satisfied that nothing will be done until we begin, by such procedure as I am starting to adopt this afternoon, to arouse the people of the country to the fact that their Congress is not doing anything so far as making an investigation of Army pay rates is concerned. I submit that the Congress should be conducting a careful investigation regarding adequate pay for the men in the armed services, and in regard to giving a decent allotment to the families of those men, who at the present time, in large numbers, are suffering unnecessary and unjustifiable hardship because the Government of the United States is not awarding them decent allotments so that they can maintain themselves in self-respect

and decency while the male members of their families are serving in the uniform of the United States.

My mail shows—as does the editorial which I shall ask permission to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks—that men in the armed forces are perfectly aware of the injustice which they and their families are suffering in regard to Army pay.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Higher Pay and Allotments for Service Men," published in the Stars and Stripes, mid-Pacific edition, of November 12, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHER PAY AND ALLOTMENTS FOR SERVICEMEN

There has been much talk recently of raising the wages of mainland civilian workers in order that take-home pay may be held at something approaching wartime levels.

The Stars and Stripes suggests that any such wage increases be accompanied by reasonable increases in servicemen's pay and dependency allotments.

The United Automobile Workers Union has asked a 30-percent boost in basic wage rates.

Henry Ford II, president of the Ford Motor Co., may agree to a 15-percent increase for Ford workers.

Secretary of Commerce Wallace has suggested a 15-percent increase in wages and around a 10-percent increase in manufactured-goods prices.

The higher wages, it is argued, are to come out of increased production efficiency, business savings due to lower taxes, and higher prices.

The Stars and Stripes does not wish to enter the dispute over whether or not the wage increases can be justified. That is a matter to be settled by genuine collective bargaining between unions and management, with impartial assistance from Government.

But the Stars and Stripes does wish to make the point that if wages of civilian workers are to go up—10, 20, 30 percent—and if prices are to go up as well, then the serviceman's pay and his dependency allotment should be raised correspondingly.

If, in the national economic picture, civilian wage increases, with accompanying price rises, can be justified, then surely a similar increase in the soldier's, sailor's, and marine's pay is no more than fair.

To be sure, the serviceman has no union to bargain for him, and rightly so. But, if Army and Navy careers, whether for a lifetime or only a year, are to be made as attractive as civilian jobs, and especially if voluntary enlistments are to amount to much, someone must see to it that the financial rewards of the man who chooses to remain in the service of his country keep pace with what he might be making as a civilian. The waiving of income tax on wartime service of EM is merely a step in the right direction.

Dependents of servicemen have to pay for food, housing, clothing, transportation, and recreation in the same markets as other civilians, the price level, if it goes up, will affect everybody at home, not just those who get the higher wages.

The Stars and Stripes has no intention of driving a wedge between civilian wage earners and servicemen and their dependents. That would be foolish because most servicemen are wage earners at heart and want nothing so much as to get back into overalls.

We are merely putting in a bid for readjustments in servicemen's pay and dependency allotments commensurate with any widespread increase in civilian wage rates.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I take this occasion to say that it is my judgment that servicemen are not going to get justice on this issue until they start to make their demands upon the Congress understood by language as to which there can be no misunderstanding.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nominations of sundry postmasters which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Wallace S. Gourley, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania;

William McClanahan, of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the western district of Tennessee; and

John P. Logan, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Oklahoma.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert E. Freer to be Federal Trade Commissioner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. HAYDEN. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 20, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 19 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CALIFORNIA

Alice Y. Brown, Hercules, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mildred H. Moran, Spring Valley, Calif., in place of R. P. Wilson, resigned.

IOWA

Leadayle I. Brayton, Somers, Iowa, in place of H. W. Hesser, removed.

KENTUCKY

Ida Sanders, Dorton, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bessie De P. Givens, Dunmore, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Conda L. Gurley, Insull, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

LOUISIANA

Kathryne S. Doggett, Blanchard, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bettye R. Kemp, Ethel, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Audrey N. Evans, Jamestown, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John L. Richard, St. Gabriel, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MICHIGAN

Paul E. Teifer, Trenton, Mich., in place of E. N. Moroney, removed.

MINNESOTA

Donald Krey Grant, Wyoming, Minn., in place of W. D. Banta, transferred.

NEW JERSEY

Josephine Agnes Washkewicz, Hainesport, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NORTH CAROLINA

A. Eloise Maness, Star, N. C., in place of T. L. Maness, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA

William A. Gamble, Edgeley, N. Dak., in place of W. E. Ravelly, resigned.

Josephine McLaughlin, Sanish, N. Dak., in place of H. H. Bugge, transferred.

John Wiedmann, Venturia, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OREGON

Weldon C. Keller, Vida, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ethel E. Morris, Modena, Pa., in place of C. L. Wagner, resigned.

PUERTO RICO

Silvestre G. Gonzalez, Lares, P. R., in place of Ricardo Mendez, Jr., resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Myron J. Cannon, Hermosa, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TEXAS

Walter L. Wiseman, La Vernia, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

James B. Pitman, Muldoon, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WISCONSIN

Albert L. Van Alstine, New London, Wis., in place of Jacob Werner, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 19 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Robert E. Freer, to be Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of 7 years from September 26, 1945.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Earline Jarman, Cuba.
Arthur A. Burgess, Winfield.

MISSOURI

Morris S. Major, Mountain Grove.

NEBRASKA

Irma M. Davis, Weston.

PENNSYLVANIA

Marie M. Bassler, Brockton.
Charles J. Tumelty, Broomall.
John W. Wasil, Calumet.
Margaret M. Reddy, Connerton.
Howard E. Gilfillan, Conoquenessing.
Vesta Y. Stevens, Flinton.
Anthony Cickavage, Frackville.
I. Elizabeth Clark, Graterford.
Mayme S. Porter, Hokendauqua.
Charles Fralley, Minisink Hills.
Dorothy M. Steuart, Salina.
Bette M. Logan, West Monterey.
Rocco Moff, Weston.
Francis T. McMahon, Wyncote.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God Almighty, as we wait at the altar of prayer, we invoke Thy blessing of peace and guidance upon all who take counsel together. Grant that the wisest thought may quicken all who are associated with the Congress, consuming the dross of unworthy ambition and giving implicit trust and a perpetual hope in the deliberations. We beseech Thee to make all hearts receptive to the deep truth that freedom is determined only by the will of a free people. We praise Thee that man's true value is reckoned far above the things born of earth and clings to those ideals which are a part of our national heritage. Thou, whose presence is the gift of peace, dwell in us, that our difficulties may provide the materials for wise achievements and contribute to the upbuilding of Thy kingdom in human relations. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 16, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1459. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases.

The message also announced that the PRESIDENT pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain

records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Justice.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of State.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. Department of War.
6. Interim International Information Service.
7. National Archives.
8. National Housing Agency.
9. Petroleum Administration for War.
10. United States District Court (Northern District of Indiana).
11. War Manpower Commission.

THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the custom of the House of Representatives, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] to read Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there could be no more appropriate occasion than the times in which we are living to again call the attention of the Congress and the people, not only of this Nation but of the world, to the words spoken by the immortal Lincoln on November 19, 1863, at the dedication of the Gettysburg National Cemetery.

Lincoln said:

Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that Nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made on last Saturday by the Conference of the Catholic Bishops of America.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an original statement he made last week before the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives of Congress in opposition to any resolution restricting the term of office of the President of the United States.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, for preservation and edification of all, the address by His Excellency P. Zadeikis, Minister of Lithuania, delivered at the banquet of Americans of Lithuanian descent, held at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., November 16, 1945, in support of the Kelly-Willis congressional resolution on Lithuania's independence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the California Creameries Association.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain letters from the Stars and Stripes.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, after all commitments and the business of the day, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include as an addition to my remarks an editorial from the Chicago Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the greatest pressure group in America is trying to undermine the workings of the OPA. I believe the OPA has saved the people of this country billions of dollars, and has saved us from inflation.

The editorial by the financial editor of the Chicago Herald on the workings of the OPA is added as a part of my remarks. It is about time this forum be not used as a wailing wall.

The editorial is as follows:

RECORDS OF TWO WARS VINDICATE THE OPA

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor)

In studying the record of World War I, economists noted that one of the greatest costs was the price inflation that took place in all countries during the war and the years that immediately followed. The cost was not economic alone, although the economic cost was staggering, but social and, in many countries, political.

With the advent of World War II, each country, almost independently, determined to take certain recognized steps to avoid the price consequences of the monetary inflation that was still regarded as the necessary method of financing the war.

A few economists scoffed at such efforts, insisted they would be futile and instead of standing aside to await the results, as would true research scientists, became voices of obstruction.

Now let's look at the record. First of all, World War II lasted longer than its predecessor and its cost was many, many times as great. The forces of inflation, consequently were much greater.

INFLATION CUT TWO-THIRDS

In the United States from 1914 until Armistice Day 4 years later, average prices rose nearly 100 percent. From the time Hitler invaded Poland until 5 years later consumer prices rose approximately 30 percent, or less than one-third as much. Two-thirds of this rise, moreover, occurred before this country entered the war and before any legislation was passed aimed at price control.

Commenting on this record, Chester Bowles has said:

"So we see what the defeatists said was impossible has, up to the present time, been accomplished."

Are the "defeatists" convinced? Not at all. In one breath they refuse to admit that anything has been accomplished. Confronted by the evidence, they charge that the results were achieved only through stifling bureaucracy and relinquishment of our freedom.

PETULANTLY COMPLAIN

Some, petulantly, complain that they have not been allowed to spend as they please the money that has been burning on their pockets. They ask:

"Why shouldn't we be allowed to do what we like with our own money?"

They never like to stay around and hear the very simple answer:

"Because there has been a war which diverted so much of the productive facilities of the Nation to the manufacture of armament that there hasn't been enough to go around and won't be for maybe a year or two. Under such circumstances the interest of the country as a whole supersedes the selfish interest of the minority which stands willing to disrupt our whole economy by bidding for scarce goods. Just be patient, the very little freedom you have lost is microscopic toward what you might very easily lose if unchecked inflation would undermine the soundness of our currency and the Government's credit."

The defeatists sometimes reply:

"But higher prices are needed to encourage production."

MANY PROBLEMS TODAY

That may or may not be. Today the United States is hard at work on reconversion. There are problems of many kinds, involving raw materials, parts, labor, prices, and a certain something without a name, let's call it "click." Production men know what we mean. When a plant "clicks" it really turns out the goods—everything is in adjustment and moves according to schedule. There is a "click" for the economy as a whole as well as for each individual plant.

There never has been a time when everyone has been satisfied with price and that would be true today. Our personal conclusion is that price is not nearly as important a factor in delaying production today as one might judge from headlines, speeches, and conversation.

Most plants have not begun to "click" as yet. Until they do, managements must largely guess as to the price they need to produce profitably. And they have been assured by the OPA that at that time, if prices are not adequate relief will be granted.

Meanwhile, it would be a good idea to support the OPA and not rock the boat.

ALFRIED KRUPP

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to deplore the action of the International War Crimes Tribunal in refusing to indict Alfred Krupp, the

present owner of the Krupp interests, the notorious son of an even more notorious parent, who is now undergoing softening of the brain but undoubtedly no softening of the heart.

At this time I hope, indeed, that the motion of the French, the Russians, and the Americans that this Alfried Krupp be indicted, is renewed and carried. I think he should be indicted not as a substitute for his father, but if I may use the phrase "in his own right" as a war criminal.

OPERATION OF STEAMSHIPS IN ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill giving the Alaska Railroad, owned by the United States Government, basic authority to operate steamships in the Alaska trade. I do so with some degree of reluctance. By and large I am not in favor of extending government operations to a field previously and traditionally served by private capital. In this case, however, it seems not only desirable but highly essential.

Alaska is now threatened by an increase in the already high and almost intolerable rates which are charged for both freight and passenger traffic. Perhaps nowhere else in the world were marine rates so high as in Alaska before the war. With the advent of war surcharges were placed in effect which in some cases were as high as 45 percent. Now we are told that these rates are not high enough to permit profitable operation and that another boost must be made. I am informed that available figures may indicate the need for a general rate structure 80 to 100 percent above that which prevailed before the war.

If these increases are allowed, or if any increases at all are allowed, the result will be economic death for Alaska. The Territory simply cannot survive under such a burden. One of the great reasons for the comparatively slow development of Alaska has been the general lack of transportation facilities and the high charges made for services with respect to such facilities as have existed. Transportation costs have always been high in pioneer countries but the pattern elsewhere has been that these costs slowly declined as population tended to increase and as modern techniques made it possible to operate carriers more cheaply. This has not been so in Alaska. There we find that with improvement in techniques, costs have gone steadily up, not down, and the population increase has been nowhere what it should have been on account of these stratospheric freight rates. Until more roads are built, until more air service is provided, and until water rates are adjusted to figures comparable with those in trades elsewhere it is, indeed, hopeless to expect the kind of development the Territory ought to have for its own benefit and for the benefit of the Nation.

While I cannot vouch for them, figures have been made available to me indicating that the ton-mile rate for automobiles from Seattle, Wash., to Seward, Alaska, was seventeen and sixty-three hundredths times as much as the ton-mile rate from San Francisco, Calif., to Honolulu, although it is several hundred miles farther to Honolulu. The rate on clothing was five and sixty-five hundredths times greater to Seward, on cement two and seventy-seven hundredths times, on iron and steel three and fifty-hundredths times, on machinery three and fifty-hundredths times, on oil and petroleum three and twenty-six hundredths times, and so on down a long list.

What are the circumstances surrounding the present move to increase rates? Soon after the war started vessels in the Alaska service were taken over by the War Shipping Administration and operated for the Administration by their owners as agents. Service was on a war-time basis and there were no regular schedules. Ships were sent where they were needed and when they were needed in conformity with military requirements. Transportation of civilian passengers and freight was properly subordinated to the bigger and more urgent job of delivering all the varied equipment necessary for the building of Army and Navy installations, and of shifting Army and Navy personnel and civilian defense workers.

Civilians generally, as was to be expected, found it tremendously difficult to travel. Stocks and foodstuffs and other essential requirements were often dangerously low in principal Alaska communities because the ships necessary to haul them were not available.

Yet Alaskans did not complain. They took all this in their stride. They knew they were in an active war zone. It is difficult for the residents of continental United States to realize how acute the Japanese threat to Alaska was from December 7, 1941, until the summer of 1943. Constant Japanese submarine surveillance, the eventual attack on Dutch Harbor in the early summer of 1942 and the subsequent occupation of the outer Aleutian Islands by the Japanese made the fears of Alaskans that their country might become a major battleground completely understandable.

In return for this diminishing and infrequent steamship service which they gladly accepted as part of their patriotic duty the residents of Alaska were compelled to pay rates substantially greater than before the war. Under direction of the Government surcharges were imposed. After the Japs had been stopped and finally expelled from the Aleutians—the only point on this continent on which they had established themselves—the surcharges were cut only in southeastern Alaska.

I did not believe, and I do not now believe, that the handful of people in Alaska should ever have been compelled to pay these surcharges. They should not have had to pay them any more than they were required to pay for the cost of naval vessels in Alaska waters. Operation of the Alaska ships by the War Shipping Administration was almost ex-

clusively a military operation and as such the additional cost should have been borne by the Nation as a whole.

These terrifically high rates would, under ordinary circumstances, have caused almost a total depopulation of Alaska. Gold mining had been closed down by Government order. The people of Alaska accepted in good spirit all the heartaches and financial losses and adjustments necessary in connection with shutting down of their second largest industry. They responded to the Government order without hesitation in the belief that total war required the stoppage of all sorts of activities not directly and vitally connected with the winning of the war. Only later were they to learn that gold mining was the only industry so affected. Only later were they to discover that race tracks were left to operate as usual, and a host of other activities in nowise connected with the winning of the war were privileged to continue as in peacetime.

The only thing that saved Alaska then was the fact that the Federal Government spent hundreds of millions of dollars in construction of military installations. These heavy expenditures with the consequent employment of thousands of men took up the slack, and increased wages made it possible for the economic life of the country to continue even with added freight charges. However, many salaried workers whose incomes rose very little, if at all, found themselves in a strait-jacket on account of steadily rising living costs.

All of us had looked forward hopefully to the war's end as a time when freight rates would go down. The thought and hope was they would go down not to the prewar levels, but, at long last, substantially below them so that the delayed settlement of Alaska on a scale commensurate with its size and resources might take place. It comes as a double shock, therefore, to learn that we are confronted by the possibility that instead of paying less for freight and passenger travel we may have to pay much more than before.

It was only a little more than a year ago that the late President Roosevelt in a speech at Bremerton, Wash., told of his hopes and aspirations for Alaska—how he believed it would prove to be the homeland for pioneering veterans and others who in the Territory could hope to find space and opportunity in the last great westward expansion of our American people.

President Truman has likewise expressed an interest in the Territory's development. He has spoken out plainly in favor of the political aspirations of Alaska's people in their striving for statehood.

These wishes, as expressed by the Nation's leaders, become meaningless when measured against the hard realities of economics as reflected by transportation charges. The development they hoped for can never be accomplished under these circumstances. Indeed, the Territory is bound to lose rather than gain population if maritime rates go up.

Alaskans and others interested were suddenly confronted on November 9 with a Maritime Commission order for a rate hearing to be held in Seattle, Wash.,

on November 27. The hearing was granted upon petition of the War Shipping Administration. Obviously, the Territorial government of Alaska could not prepare a case between November 9 and 27. Equally obviously no other interested parties in Alaska could hope in any such limited time to make an effective showing.

We have petitioned the Maritime Commission to postpone the hearing at least until spring. We believe we are entitled to such postponement as a minimum consideration. If reports in common circulation are correct, the War Shipping Administration will withdraw from Alaska early next spring. If that is true, it is rather difficult to understand why it should be so insistent at this late date about increasing rates. The argument of the agency that deficits are being incurred and must be wiped out is not valid. So far as I am aware, there was no legal compulsion for WSA to continue to operate Alaska vessels after the end of the war. It is said deficits have been continuing ever since then. Why, then, did not WSA turn the ships back immediately and allow the private operators to present their case to the Maritime Commission? It is difficult to understand—for me it is impossible to understand—on the merits of the case—the agency's seemingly sudden concern as to the rates of a service which it is not likely will last more than 3 months.

I am told that labor costs are unbearably high and labor is inefficient in the Alaska marine service. I am told the owners of the Alaska fleets are anxious to have the Maritime Commission set a higher schedule of rates now so that when the vessels are turned back they can represent that the rates were established by one branch of the Government at the request of another branch and therefore are fair and proper. I do not believe this is the time or the place to debate the merits or lack thereof of these contentions.

However, I do believe, and emphatically, that the hearing should be postponed. It should be postponed so the main parties in interest, the people of Alaska, may be heard. Only yesterday I was informed in a telephone conversation with Gov. Ernest Gruening of Alaska that he intends to call a special session of the Alaska legislature in March. It is possible the legislature would desire to make an appropriation so that experts to present Alaska's case might be retained. Funds for such a purpose are not now available in the Territorial treasury.

The hearing should be postponed, too, until the owners of the vessels are in control of their ships. The War Shipping Administration should not be a party to this proceeding. After all, the Alaska service is still operating under conditions far from normal, and the charges which might be necessary today could easily be far too high a few months from now.

It may be that evidence before the Maritime Commission at the hearing—to be held, as I hope, at a later date—will demonstrate conclusively that present rates are too low. It may be necessary upon the basis of the findings to raise them. If that should be so let me make this prediction—tramp steamships

will come to Alaska, will take a good part of the cream of the trade, and the profits of the Alaska operators will drop further to the point where they will be compelled to come to the Maritime Commission for yet another increase. It will lead only into a vicious circle, satisfactory to no one and simply disastrous to Alaska.

If the hearing is held and increases are allowed I suppose the War Shipping Administration, the vessels' owners, and the labor unions that furnish men for those ships will be happy, but some thought should be given somewhere along the line to several scores of thousands of Alaskans. They will suffer, acutely. In consideration of this I am introducing a bill giving the Alaska Railroad the right to operate steamships. We must either have Government operation or a Government subsidy. We are not asking too much in asking for one or the other.

Alaska is the responsibility of the Federal Government. Alaska is the responsibility of this Congress. In sad truth we Alaskans are little more than wards. I sometimes think we have been niggardly in what we have asked for during the years, but we have always received even less. We have repeatedly asked for more home rule, for extension to the Territory of at least the minimum rights of self-government, but these pleas have gone unheard. With them, we could have hoped for a growth and development which would have allowed us to take our proper place. Without them we have no alternative except to appeal to this body.

It is grievous to have to contemplate that right now when we as a Nation are so concerned with freedom of peoples all over the world and the democratic aspirations of those peoples that we so blindly overlook something that ought to be of much more intimate concern—the rights of American citizens living under the American flag on this very continent.

STRIKES IN THE GREAT LAKES MINING AREA

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a situation involving the methods of the National Labor Relations Board in the matter of calling for strike votes. This has to do with the whole Lake Superior iron mining industry.

All of these companies have unqualified no-strike contracts for the life of their contracts. I emphasize the point that these are unqualified.

There is at the present time no dispute between any of these companies and their men. In spite of this, they have all received notice from the National Labor Relations Board fixing November 28 for a strike vote, which, as a representative of the taxpayers of my district, I emphasize is taken at the expense of the Government.

Even were there a dispute between any of these companies and the unions work-

ing in their mines, there is a requirement that any action must go through grievance procedure first. Notice from the National Labor Relations Board for this strike vote gives no indication of any dispute nor of any alleged dispute.

Representatives of the Board state that they are obliged by law to call for a strike vote—and this without having to find any reason—simply because application has been made by the union.

When these instructions were first issued, it was said that an inclusive count would be made rather than a count by mines and plants. This was so flagrant that strong protest was made with the result that orders to the field men were reversed and counts will be made by mines and plants.

From information that I have been able to collect I find that there is the probability that these counts will all be lumped and handled as though they were the result of counts of an entire industry before they reach the President.

There can be little doubt that this is one of the efforts being made to bury the little fellow completely.

In examining the correspondence upon which I am basing this statement I was very much interested to find that the War Labor Board used the caption "Re Steel strike ballot."

The Lake Superior iron mining industry is not a part of United States Steel. Those of us in the Great Lakes area know full well that every effort is being made to force some such arrangement in order that there can be no voice from the small mine owners. This heading is, therefore, of particular interest as it divulges the purpose of the NLRB.

The Smith-Connally Act is being used as some of us feared it would be—as an excuse to call strikes rather than as a preventive, in this particular instance, in a situation where every company has an incorporated nonstrike clause and where there is no dispute of any kind involved.

As representative of the taxpayers of the Twenty-second District of Ohio and as a loyal American, I protest such methods.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GARY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an address on postwar problems delivered by himself at the annual meeting of the Colorado State Chamber of Commerce at Colorado Springs, Colo., on November 9, 1945.

Mr. PITTINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of rehabilitation and our postwar policy in Germany, Poland, and other countries, and include a newspaper item and a quotation; also to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway project and include some quotations.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include excerpts from the

testimony of General Robins, of the War Department engineers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, my remarks at this time will be very brief. Last Monday I announced I would report today to the American people on the State of the Union with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. I have to report that nothing has been done.

When I received the home-town papers, this morning I read with astonishment a statement by an alleged opponent of the seaway project that atomic power would make the seaway obsolete, I think he said, in about 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, there are four classes of people that are opposed to the project. Three of those classes I am going to refer to. The fourth class consists of a lot of well-intentioned but misinformed American citizens who have not been converted to the cause as yet. The three classes to which I wish to refer particularly are the ones that are spending money and engaging in a lot of tommyrot propaganda, against the seaway.

I must congratulate this boy who dug up a new excuse for opposing the seaway. The opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project have been hard pressed for some real arguments against it. They have sunk to new low levels, if such a thing were possible, when they dig up this fanciful argument that they must give us a word of caution before we waste any money on the seaway until we find out about nuclear energy. If their arguments about atomic power was anything but silly, then they would be advocating that the Government fill up New York Harbor, Boston Harbor, and the harbor at New Orleans, and other harbors, because they would be afraid that atomic bombs would ruin those great harbors.

REPORT OF NOVEMBER 12

Mr. Speaker, a week ago, November 12, I reported in the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as to lack of progress on the St. Lawrence project. I called attention to the fact that no progress had been made. I am sorry that I have to report the same situation today: No progress.

Here are the facts:

Senate Joint Resolution 104, authorizing construction of the project, was introduced in the Senate by Senator BARKLEY and others on October 2, 1945. It was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

October 3, 1945, President Truman sent a message to Congress calling for construction of the St. Lawrence project.

October 4, 1945, I called for immediate action on the Barkley resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 104. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, page A4170.

On November 12, 1945, I called attention to delay and no action on the Barkley resolution. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 10601; also Appendix, page A4835.

Well, here we are, and 43 days have elapsed since October 2, 1945. Nothing new to report.

WHAT IS THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT?

A vast number of people with whom I discuss this subject tell me that they do not know anything about the project. They are honest and frank in their statements. The project will sell itself once the American people know and understand the facts. The seaway plan visualizes the creation of a great marine highway for commerce, providing deep-draft navigation from the westernmost port on Lake Superior, 2,687 miles to the Atlantic Ocean. We already have a 14-foot channel and by increasing the depth at one or two places from 14 feet to 27 feet it will be possible for oceangoing vessels to come up the St. Lawrence River from the Atlantic Ocean and touch at the ports on Lake Ontario, Lake Erie, Lake Huron, Lake Michigan, and Lake Superior. All that remains to be done is to dredge channels in certain spots to a depth of 27 feet. Since ancient times water commerce has invariably contributed to the prosperity and wealth of the peoples and the nations of the world. The St. Lawrence seaway and power project is intended to accomplish that result.

GEN. THOMAS M. ROBINS TESTIFIES

One of the most distinguished Army engineers in the world is Gen. Thomas M. Robins, of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. This group is commonly referred to as the War Department engineers. General Robins has a long and an honorable career in the service of his country. His record in the work of the War Department engineers is outstanding and Members of Congress who have become acquainted with what he has done, recognize him as a most valuable public servant.

General Robins is a student of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Over a period of many years, he has had to do with this proposed development, on account of the fact that it comes within the jurisdiction of the Army engineers to recommend to Congress for or against proposed river and harbor improvements. So, General Robins, when he testified on Thursday, June 19, 1941, before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives, was talking, not as just an ordinary engineer, but as an expert who had devoted years of his life to a study of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. He knew every imaginary argument—and the arguments are all imaginary—against this project. He brushed them off, just like getting rid of flies in the summertime. At the time he testified, the Rivers and Harbors Committee had under consideration a bill to develop the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. This was a bill introduced by the gentleman from Texas, Chairman JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, and is practically the same kind of bill that is now pending at this time in the Congress of the United States.

GENERAL ROBINS ENDORSES THE PROJECT

I quote exactly from the record of the testimony of June 19, 1941, as follows:

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE BASIN

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS,
Washington, D. C., Thursday, June 19, 1941.

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, we have General Robins before us this morning. You may proceed, General.

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. THOMAS M. ROBINS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY

General ROBINS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the St. Lawrence River is a natural transportation route between the Great Lakes and the sea and offers an exceptional opportunity for the production of hydroelectric power.

In the early stages of the commercial development in North America the St. Lawrence River was partially improved for both navigation and power purposes, and for many years plans have been in the making for the complete and full utilization of the resources of this waterway.

It has been generally understood throughout the country that some day these plans would have to be carried out. In my opinion, that day has now arrived. The country can no longer afford to be without the transportation facilities and the power which can be made available by full and comprehensive development of the St. Lawrence River, either from the standpoint of national defense or the commercial needs of our great inland empire bordering on the Great Lakes.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the testimony of a disinterested American citizen and Government official, and it will carry conviction with everyone who wants to see the right thing done for the American people.

I cannot, Mr. Speaker, now discuss the possibilities of hydroelectric power, but anyone interested can get the unvarnished truth from the testimony of General Robins and you will find out just how much electric power is going to waste because of the fact that this project has not been undertaken and completed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two clippings from the Mail Bag sent to him by an overseas serviceman.

Mr. ROCKWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief article appearing in the November issue of Rotarian.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from Lt. Alan S. Wood.

SURIBACHI FLAG

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HINSHAW addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast made by himself and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

UNJUST CRITICISM OF WITNESSES IN PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the American people are looking for great results from the Pearl Harbor probe now going on at the other side of the Capitol. It seems to me, however, that the members of that committee might very well avoid any partisanship in their discussions and, above all, avoid personal attacks on any of the witnesses who appear before that committee.

According to the newspapers last week certain attacks were leveled against Rear Admiral Thomas B. Inglis, Chief of Naval Intelligence. Admiral Inglis is a hero of this war, a man above all reproach, and it is an outrage that anybody should accuse him of falsification. He is a man who wears the Navy Cross, the Silver Star, and the Bronze Star for heroic action, and the Purple Heart. The last time I saw him was at the Naval Hospital where he was just completing a 7 months' siege resulting from wounds received in his heroic rescue, or attempted rescue, of the aircraft carrier *Princeton* when his own craft, the *Birmingham*, was very severely damaged, and in spite of painful and severe wounds to himself he returned from a hospital ship the next day to reassume command of the *Birmingham*, and bring her back into Pearl Harbor safely thousands of miles away.

For anyone on either side of the aisle to attack the patriotism, the courage, the loyalty, or the truthfulness of such a man is absolutely absurd and without foundation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I want to commend the gentleman for his remarks. It is high time that someone should defend the character of these witnesses.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Star.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; to include in one a newspaper article, in one a resolution, and in one an editorial.

COFFEE SUBSIDY

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday papers inform the Members of Congress that the administration is going to spend around \$24,000,000 for a 6-month coffee subsidy. During the war a number of alibis were offered for

subsidy plans used to conceal the spreading inflation and the dilution of the value of the dollar.

The war is over, so the war alibi for subsidies is gone.

It should be most interesting to hear the alibi explaining this latest trick from the New Deal's bag of financial black magic.

Will this twenty-four million come out of the bond drive now going on? Does this subsidy mean that the administration has adopted the Nazi scheme of peacetime subsidies to conceal inflation?

Congress and the people, whose savings must finance these financial acrobatics, should get the truth.

UNJUST CRITICISM OF WITNESSES IN PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to listen to the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] who just spoke in connection with the Pearl Harbor investigation, and I think that we can all take heed to what he said. Character and reputation is something that cannot be bought; it is earned by act and deed and example. This inquiry should not be conducted from a Republican or a Democratic angle. It is a question of an impartial investigation. In that I think I speak the sentiments of a majority of the Members of this House. I hope that from now on the investigation will be conducted on a high plane, and that all of the members of the investigating committee will realize that they occupy a quasi-judicial position and that as such it will be more consistent with the dignity of the hearings, the proceedings, and the dignity of the Congress if members of the investigating committee would refrain from uttering or making statements or expressing judgment until after the evidence is in. I join with the gentleman from Michigan in the fine statement that he has just made and believe that great good will come out of it.

SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are communities in New York State so depleted of doctors that mothers are neglected in childbirth and both the mother and infant lost for lack of medical care. The Army and Navy have hoarded physicians and are now doing so, when the facts show that thousands of doctors in the military service are idle. There are large areas of the country where the homes of the aged, orphan asylums, schools, colleges, and farm pop-

ulations are deprived of the care of competent physicians. There are cases where physicians of recognized ability, now frozen in the military service, who have had only one soldier to treat in over a year. The military has sought to escape criticism by placing the decision in the hands of a civilian doctor in each State. The officer in New York State assigned to decide whether a doctor in the service is to be demobilized is Dr. Joe R. Clemmons, chairman of the New York Procurement and Assignment Service, Federal Security Agency, formerly the Manpower Commission. It is evident that little attention is given to national health, safety, or interest when cases are presented to the authority for relieving medical officers from active duty. This arrogant indifference of the military to the peacetime requirements of the citizens may, however, serve the salutary purpose of warning against the dangers of militarism.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a petition from a group of Rhode Island citizens. It may exceed the limit, but I doubt it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include several editorials on the subject of censorship.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial from the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include remarks from a speaking program held recently in his district.

Mr. RAMEY (at the request of Mr. WILSON) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

HOUSING FOR RETURNED VETERANS

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill in the House of Representatives, a veterans' home priority bill, in order to provide broader, more generous and more careful provisions for home and farm procurement for veterans.

This bill provides generally as follows: First. Unconditional priority for building materials for homes or farms for veterans.

Second. Revocation of any statutes or executive orders which operate to impede the purposes of the bill for liberalizing conditions under which veterans may ac-

quire homes or farms, improvements thereto or liquidation of debts thereon.

Third. An increase from \$2,000 to \$5,000 in the sum the Government will guarantee to private lending agencies in loans for veterans' homes or farms.

Fourth. Establishment of a special Veterans' Housing Bureau in the Veterans' Administration to make studies and operate specifically to aid veterans in procuring loans for the acquisition of homes or farms.

Fifth. Requirements for other Federal agencies to cooperate with the Housing Bureau of the Veterans' Administration in a protracted effort to provide all veterans who may desire them, with homes or farms.

Sixth. Heavy penalties for evasion on the part of Government officials of any of the terms of the broadened act.

Mr. Speaker, veterans returning from overseas service are coming back home to be confronted with an inexcusable condition of confusion and frustration. Men who have been through the horrors of war and months of living in water up to their shoulders in fox holes and in the slime and filth of tropical islands have a big enough job to do in readjusting themselves to peaceful and orderly lives at home without being loaded with additional burdens as a penalty for having bravely served their country in war.

The job of readjustment, with all the help the Government can give, will be beyond the strength of many unless a very intelligent program is set up and very intelligently administered.

There is no place like home. This is peculiarly and poignantly true in the heart and mind of the man or woman who has served in the hell of war overseas. No single measure could have a greater effect in giving the returned veteran a stake in his Nation, in his community, and in his life than a home of his own in which to house a wife and a family of happy children. I can conceive of no influence which could more rapidly eradicate the nightmares of war experiences from the slumber of returned veterans than to be engaged in the happy duties of building their own homes, improving their own farms, taking their own brides over their own thresholds and preparing to raise happy families of useful citizens.

There is no good purpose to be served in closing our eyes to the fact that the veterans have been given the run-around in thousands of cases. The terms of my bill are perfectly simple, plain, and logical; if there is anybody in the United States who deserves unqualified priority of materials to build homes and improve farms, it is the men and women who went out to fight in the defense of this Nation. If there is anyone who deserves loans at a low rate of interest—certainly as low as we are considering making loans to foreign nations—it is the man or woman who went out to fight in the defense of our Nation. That is why I provided in my bill that the Government shall assume the payment of all interest above 2 percent on guaranteed loans to veterans for homes and farm-procurement purposes.

XCI—681

While the rest of us, no matter how hard we worked, got good wages at home; lived, worked, ate, and slept in comfortable and safe surroundings, and while we were able to buy bonds and lay up savings against the problems and the confusion of postwar reconstruction and readjustment, the men and women of our armed forces were fighting for \$50 a month; they were living under conditions that tried not only their bodies but their nerves as well. Therefore, I think it cannot be denied by any fair-minded person that the men and women of our armed forces should be given every assistance within the power of the American people to acquire as rapidly as possible homes and farms on conditions that will make it not only possible but easy for the veteran to pay off his financial obligations.

I have no patience with those who talk about the possibility that some homes may revert to the Government. This country needs housing—good housing—as it never needed housing before. The way of human nature is such that the veteran will have a tough time financing a home or a farm unless a special effort is made through the Veterans' Administration to help him through the unavoidable intricacies and complications of private loans for home and farm procurement.

I think it is obvious that by far the greatest majority of the veterans, given the opportunity to acquire homes or farms under such conditions that they can live comfortably and pay off their debts in due time, will take root in their respective communities and will develop a civic pride equal in every way to their magnificent patriotism and their unbounded bravery in fighting and suffering and enduring for their country.

We can do no less than this for the veteran, and if I can find any more to do for them I shall certainly move to accomplish it if possible.

I cannot see how anyone can oppose the simple measures embraced in my bill, and I do not believe anyone will oppose them.

I cannot conceive of an America that could be made as sound, as safe, and as free as quickly in any other way than by enabling veterans to procure homes and farms and to settle down to the comforts and the pursuits of a peaceful America under an orderly and law-abiding liberty.

DISCHARGE OF FATHERS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, receipt in my office of a petition signed by about 1,200 wives and other relatives of servicemen leads me to renew my demand on the floor of the House for the passage of a bill which I recently introduced calling for the discharge of fathers in the armed forces. I believe the American home must be preserved. I feel that unless fathers are brought home soon to their loved ones to assist

in the rearing of their children and to help build a better country out of this great America of ours, we shall retard the postwar growth and the progress of the Nation for many years. I repeat the American home must be preserved. It can only be preserved by bringing back the thousands upon thousands of fathers who are in the service at this time.

It is only fair to reward the magnificent efforts made by the wives and mothers of servicemen's children to see that the heads of families the country over are allowed to come back.

Otherwise, we cannot expect that new generation of Americans will be raised in the atmosphere of the institution which has made America the most progressive and the most spiritually minded Nation in the world.

I hope Congress will take immediate action on this matter because the War and Navy Departments have thus far failed to do anything about it. Every American family needs the father in the home nearly as much as the mother. Together husband and wife are equipped to rear their children. Apart, they cannot accomplish nearly as complete and perfect a job.

RETURN OF OVERSEAS VETERANS

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, just recently I called the attention of the House to what is going on with the hundreds of ships that are owned by our Government. And also the complaints from all over the country and our veterans as to why our overseas men have not been brought home. The only excuse being given is that there are not enough ships.

Since making those remarks, I understand that there are now more than 600 of our American-owned ships in the hands of foreign nations. It is no wonder that there is a shortage of ships, and our boys have not been brought home. It seems we give everything to the world and penalize our own men.

I have introduced a resolution calling for the immediate return of our ships to this country to be used for the immediate return of our boys from overseas, and it is included herewith:

A bill to provide for the securing of our ships with foreign nations and the return of the armed forces overseas, and for other purposes

Whereas foreign nations have more than 600 ships owned by the United States Government; and

Whereas these ships were paid for by the fathers and mothers of those in the armed forces; and

Whereas the War and Navy Departments say that there are not enough ships to bring home the armed forces; and

Whereas there are millions of armed forces overseas waiting to be returned home,

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States, the Department of State, the Maritime Commission, and the War Shipping Administration, immediately secure our ships from foreign nations and have

them used for the returning of our overseas armed forces to the United States.

THE RIGHT OF PETITION

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Chester Bowles, the OPA Administrator, in a statement before Congressman PATMAN's Small Business Committee intimated that a flood of protests from the auto dealers of America, in the shape of telegrams and telephone calls, constituted "government by pressure," and that this flood of protests was akin to the CIO lobbyist groups that have recently afflicted us like a plague of locusts, it proves to me that he does not know the difference between the constitutional right of petition or protest and the somewhat obnoxious practice of lobbying, as it is usually carried on today. In order to set him straight in this matter I include in my remarks a pungent editorial taken from the Rockford Morning Star, Rockford, Ill., November 15, 1945, that clearly points out the wide difference between the right of petition and the practice of lobbying. I hope Mr. Bowles will take due notice thereof and will guide himself accordingly.

RIGHT OF PETITION

OPA Administrator Bowles ran up against the right of petition in full flood this week, and didn't like it. In fact, he labeled it "government by pressure," forgetting that petition is anchored in the Constitution.

The flood was turned loose by the Nation's automobile dealers—in the main, small businessmen. The protest was against the cost-absorption formula devised by Bowles, under which manufacturers were to have a slight increase to meet higher labor and material costs, but which was to come out of the hide of the dealers, who were to be ceilinged at old schedules. The automobile dealers are not the only businessmen included in this cost-absorption policy.

The dealers turned loose a flood of protesting telephone calls and telegrams. Bowles said poignantly that the calls tied up the OPA's switchboards and "delayed the receipt of many important communications." He expressed his admiration for the efficiency with which the campaign was organized; nonetheless he branded petition mere pressure.

It may be that the petitions should properly have been addressed to Congress. Congress, indeed, got its share. But the executive branch has to so great a degree assumed autonomy that it is a fair question whether administrative offices can claim immunity from petitioners. If they tracked up Bowles' front porch instead of going around to the tradesman's entrance, their trespass is probably defensible.

In any case we suspect that Bowles will have to change his views about petition. It is an integral right in our system. It isn't merely pressure lobbying. Moreover the auto dealers, who have taken in good spirit a lot of punishment during the war and have not griped, had a special right to be heard.

Is it a lobby when a group of businessmen who have remained silent and forbearing for years suddenly comes to the front with a protest? The dictionary defines a lobby otherwise; a lobby, says Webster, "frequents" a governmental hall with its pleas. The auto

dealers haven't "frequented" Bowles' vestibule or that of Congress. This protest isn't lobbying, it is a petition.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered on Saturday afternoon at the National Cemetery at Gettysburg commemorating Lincoln's speech there 82 years ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes today, concerning the return of stranded soldiers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, over the week end the War Department announced that it has further reduced the critical score under the point system to 55. I have at least 100 letters from high-point men in both the European and Pacific theaters, who are sitting around, doing nothing, waiting to come home. Some of these have as high as 95 points. I ask, Mr. Speaker, what good does it do for the War Department to reduce the critical score under the point system unless they bring the boys home and discharge them? Apparently this announcement is just another sop to keep the public pacified.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

PLANS AND BLUEPRINTS FOR A LASTING PEACE

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on December 6, 1943, I extended my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on plans and blueprints for a lasting peace. Recently I had occasion to reread that statement and find no reason for changing it except to underscore some things. Momentous events have happened since December 6, 1943—events of which we could only hope and dream at that time. Chief among these events has come the end of the war, and very significant—the creation of the atomic bomb.

In this statement back in 1943, I considered several proposals of world organization such as Union Now, which I rejected, and Ely Culbertson's World Federation, of which I approved the general outline. I do not know Ely Culbertson very well, personally, and have talked to him face to face only twice, but I have read some of his books and lectures, and I am more and more convinced that he has a reasonable and sensible way out of the present world dilemma.

There has just come to my attention a paper by Ely Culbertson on how to control the atomic threat. This I commend to the attention of every Member of Congress and administrative officer of Government, for somebody had better think of something quick, or it may be too late to think of anything. As I said back in 1943 Culbertson had offered—not a perfect plan—but the most sensible and feasible proposal that had yet come to my attention. The United Nations Charter and all the recent steps taken to form a union of peace-loving nations materialize his idea in general, and it may be that with such amendments as Culbertson now proposes the perfected United Nations Charter could provide an effective organization giving safety against chaos and destruction. It is a slender hope.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered recently in Washington by Professor Bliss.

Mr. BARDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and insert a sermon delivered by Rev. F. Hubert Morris, of the First Presbyterian Church of New Bern, N. C.

CONTROL OF ATOMIC POWER

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks, and include therein a statement by President Truman, Prime Minister Attlee, and Prime Minister King.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday President Truman, Prime Minister Clement Attlee, and Prime Minister Mackenzie King released their statement with reference to the control of atomic power. I congratulate them on the fine statement they made. It came at a very opportune time. It came at a time when the people of this country and the people of other countries were becoming somewhat confused about the control of atomic power and at a time when people in high places, as high as the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs in the Senate, were saying that this is the opportunity of the United States to control the world by dropping a bomb whenever we saw some country getting out of hand. This idea would be the quickest way to promote a third world war. Our people do not want to control the world; they are anxious to cooperate with the United Na-

tions Organization to outlaw and bring about a permanent peace. This statement will ease the strained relations we have with some countries; it will unify our thinking toward the use of atomic power for civilian pursuits. I think it came at a time when such a statement was needed.

TEXT OF ATOM COMMUNIQUE

The President of the United States, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and the Prime Minister of Canada have issued the following statement:

"1. We recognize that the application of recent scientific discoveries to the methods and practice of war has placed at the disposal of mankind means of destruction hitherto unknown, against which there can be no adequate military defense, and in the employment of which no single nation can in fact have a monopoly.

"2. We desire to emphasize that the responsibility for devising means to insure that the new discoveries shall be used for the benefit of mankind, instead of as a means of destruction, rest not on our nations alone, but upon the whole civilized world. Nevertheless, the progress that we have made in the development and use of atomic energy demands that we take an initiative in the matter, and we have accordingly met together to consider the possibility of international action:

"(a) To prevent the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes.

"(b) To promote the use of recent and future advances in scientific knowledge, particularly in the utilization of atomic energy, for peaceful and humanitarian ends.

"3. We are aware that the only complete protection for the civilized world from the destructive use of scientific knowledge lies in the prevention of war. No system of safeguards that can be devised will of itself provide an effective guarantee against production of atomic weapons by a nation bent on aggression. Nor can we ignore the possibility of the development of other weapons, or of new methods of warfare, which may constitute as great a threat to civilization as the military use of atomic energy.

"4. Representing as we do, the three countries which possess the knowledge essential to the use of the atomic energy, we declare at the outset our willingness, as a first contribution, to proceed with the exchange of fundamental scientific information and the interchange of scientists and scientific literature for peaceful ends with any nation that will fully reciprocate.

"5. We believe that the fruits of scientific research should be made available to all nations, and that freedom of investigation and free interchange of ideas are essential to the progress of knowledge. In pursuance of this policy, the basic scientific information essential to the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes has already been made available to the world. It is our intention that all further information of this character that may become available from time to time shall be similarly treated. We trust that other nations will adopt the same policy, thereby creating an atmosphere of reciprocal confidence in which political agreement and cooperation will flourish.

"6. We have considered the question of the disclosure of detailed information concerning the practical industrial application of atomic energy. The military exploitation of atomic energy depends, in large part, upon the same methods and processes as would be required for industrial uses.

"We are not convinced that the spreading of the specialized information regarding the practical application of atomic energy, before it is possible to devise effective, reciprocal, and enforceable safeguards acceptable to all nations, would contribute to a constructive solution of the problem of the atomic bomb.

On the contrary, we think it might have the opposite effect. We are, however, prepared to share, on a reciprocal basis with others of the United Nations, detailed information concerning the practical industrial application of atomic energy just as soon as effective enforceable safeguards against its use for destructive purposes can be devised.

"7. In order to attain the most effective means of entirely eliminating the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes and promoting its widest use for industrial and humanitarian purposes, we are of the opinion that at the earliest practicable date a commission should be set up under the United Nations Organization to prepare recommendations for submission to the Organization.

"The Commission should be instructed to proceed with the utmost dispatch and should be authorized to submit recommendations from time to time dealing with separate phases of its work.

"In particular the Commission should make specific proposals:

"(a) For extending between all nations the exchange of basic scientific information for peaceful ends.

"(b) For control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to insure its use only for peaceful purposes.

"(c) For the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction.

"(d) For effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect complying states against the hazards of violations and evasions.

"8. The work of the Commission should proceed by separate stages, the successful completion of each one of which will develop the necessary confidence of the world before the next stage is undertaken. Specifically it is considered that the Commission might well devote its attention first to the wide exchange of scientists and scientific information, and as a second stage to the development of full knowledge concerning natural resources of raw materials.

"9. Faced with the terrible realities of the application of science to destruction, every nation will realize more urgently than before the overwhelming need to maintain the rule of law among nations and to banish the scourge of war from the earth. This can only be brought about by giving wholehearted support to the United Nations Organization, and by consolidating and extending its authority, thus creating conditions of mutual trust in which all peoples will be free to devote themselves to the arts of peace. It is our firm resolve to work without reservation to achieve these ends."

MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 2788

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Committee on the Judiciary on H. R. 2788 has already been filed. I ask unanimous consent to have permission to file minority views on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter and some newspaper excerpts.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in three instances, in the first to include a radio address, and in the second and third to include newspaper editorials.

Mr. NEELY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the New York Times entitled "The Pearl Harbor Inquiry."

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include two editorials by the associate editor of the Washington Evening Star on the question of Washington suffrage.

Mr. RIZLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include two newspaper statements.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a short article.

CAPT. THOMAS BROWNING INGLIS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in 1914 I appointed to the Naval Academy a youngster named Thomas Browning Inglis. He is the distinguished officer who is now appearing before the committee of investigation of Pearl Harbor. In my opinion he has been subjected to treatment such as no reputable, high-minded, patriotic member of our armed forces should be subjected to, especially by a Member of either House of the Congress.

I think I should tell the House something of the background of this young officer. His father was the pastor of my Presbyterian Church in Bay City, Mich. When I first knew the boy he was a youngster in short trousers. He was a fine boy. His father died while he was pastor of my church. The mother, in addition to her many other accomplishments, had been one of the finest school teachers who ever taught in Michigan's schools, and was the beautiful character which one would expect the mother of this splendid officer to be.

She was the mother of four children, of which Tom was the youngest. After her husband's death Mrs. Inglis took her little brood to Cheboygan, Mich. She bought 40 acres of cut-over land, built a little house thereon and proceeded to raise and educate as best she could her little brood. The older children went to the public schools. Tom, being the youngest, was kept at home and his mother took charge of his education during his earlier years. I doubt whether he attended the public schools for more than 2 years. As I recall, he was not a high-school graduate when he entered one of the preparatory schools near Annapolis, where he remained for 3 months. He took his substantiating examination with 600 other nominees, and, very much to my surprise and amazement, he received a "4.00" in English and also a "4.00" in mathematics. Every Member of the House knows the significance of these perfect marks. To me this was then, and still remains, an amazing accomplishment, especially for a boy with the limited opportunities he

had had to prepare himself for such an examination.

The record of Thomas Browning Inglis at Annapolis was a splendid one. While there he gained the admiration, respect, and affection of everyone who knew him. He has retained that admiration, respect, and affection in all the years since. His professional assignments have come to him from those under whom he has served, and the splendid way in which he has handled the duties thereof account for the fact that today, at 46 years of age, he is a rear admiral in the Regular United States Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not carelessly appoint youngsters to the Military and Naval Academies. I make it my business to know all there is to know about every youngster I so honor. As the years go by, I do not lose sight of the boys who, through my appointment, have embarked upon a career in the armed forces of our country. I make it my business to know how they are progressing and how they are succeeding in the discharge of their duties. I do this because I have a pride in my selections. I want each one of them in their service to reflect credit upon the service and the country. At the moment I do not recall a single one of these boys who has during his term of service reflected anything but the highest credit to himself and his country.

Mr. Speaker, I have made many appointments to the two academies. In no single instance has one of my appointees served more honorably, more efficiently, or with greater distinction than has Rear Adm. Thomas Browning Inglis. There is no officer in the entire United States Navy who has a greater love for the Navy and who is more jealous of its fair name than he. He is a most honorable gentleman. Men of his character do not lie.

Mr. Speaker, during this past war Rear Admiral Inglis has spent most of his time at sea in command of fighting ships. He commanded a ship in the Atlantic when the tragedy of Pearl Harbor occurred. His latest command was the cruiser *Birmingham*, which had under his command as fine a fighting record as any ship in our Navy.

My colleague, Representative BRADLEY, of Michigan, has referred to only a small part of the combat activities of this fine ship. She was in practically all of the battle activities up to and including the time when the *Princeton* was seriously damaged by Japanese bombs and the explosion of her aft magazine. It was while lying alongside the *Princeton*, which had been set afire by bombs—and when the *Birmingham* lay alongside—that the aft magazine exploded. Most of the *Birmingham's* crew was on deck helping to fight the fire, and her casualties in dead and wounded far exceeded those of the *Princeton*. It was then that Admiral Inglis was so seriously wounded. In his wounded condition he brought his ship across the Pacific, and thereafter was hospitalized for seven long months. His record in peacetime service as well as during the war has been something of which the Navy can be, and I am sure is, very proud.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SHORTAGE OF SOIL PIPE AND PLUMBING

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, modern homes cannot be built in the countryside or in the cities without soil pipe and plumbing equipment. We can pass all the resolutions we want to with respect to having homes for veterans and other people, but the fact remains you cannot build homes until the material is produced.

One man tells me he has 4,000 homes under construction and can make no progress whatsoever. The soil pipe industry informs me in a series of letters this week that their production has dropped from 500,000 tons per year to 115,000 tons per year. When we get ready to go back to work in this country we can build homes and do other things, but until then your resolutions are not going to be very effective.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

RETURNING SERVICEMEN

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from a soldier.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from a soldier from my town in which he states there are 15,000 men with points from 60 to as high as 90 on the island of Leyte, with no boats taking anyone out for the past 13 days. They are almost despairing as to whether or not they are going to get home. They are wondering what will happen to the lower-point men when they are so slow with these high-point men. I only hope the Army and Navy will extend their efforts to get shipping and get these boys back home. It is hard on their morale and might affect them throughout many years of their life.

The letter I refer to reads as follows:

PALO LEYTE, P. I., November 9, 1945.
Congressman C. W. VURSELL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter pertains to the forgotten men on Leyte of which I am one. I've been overseas 20½ months, 12½ months spent here on Leyte island, and needless to say, I'm sick and tired of the place and everyone that continually screams "No shipping space." As of September 2 I have 66 points which make me eligible to go home on November 1. Will I ever get home to my wife and child? I'm inclined to think not unless you and all the other Congressmen do something about the so-called no boats available story that we hear every day. Can't more Liberty ships be converted to troop ships as the enlisted man's notable friend Lieutenant Colonel Davidson in Manila suggested nearly 1 month ago?

There are at present 15,009 returnees at the Twenty-eighth Replacement Depot at Tacloban, Leyte, including numerous men with over 90 points. There has been no shipment whatsoever—except 18 men on emergency furlough—for the past 13 days.

Over 1,100 men have been in the depot 42 days awaiting shipment. Only 2,650 have been shipped out of here during the entire month of October. So, apparently no ships whatever are assigned to Leyte, and the men are taken out now and then by drips and drops. My complaint is: if these men are never moved how in the name of our good Lord will the 60- and 70-point men ever get a chance to go home? Please turn on the heat where it counts. For results use the club, not faith.

I came across on a converted freighter, the U. S. S. *Seawitch*. They brought us over on anything that would float—including cattle boats—so, why can't they take us back to our loved ones on similar boats?

Will you please answer this letter? I'd like to know the answers and facts as to why we are being delayed.

Sincerely,

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his own remarks in two instances and include excerpts in each.

Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each to include certain records.

THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the morning press advises that the UAW-CIO in Michigan may, within 48 hours, because its demand for a 30-percent increase in wages has been denied by General Motors, call a strike which before it is ended may throw out of their jobs over 100,000 workers and which will indirectly affect more than a million people.

Now, I am asking if some Member on the majority side; if some representative of the UAW-CIO; some representative of the Political Action Committee, of Sidney Hillman, of R. J. Thomas, president of the UAW-CIO; of Walter Reuther and Richard Frankenstein, the CIO's recent candidate for mayor of Detroit; some representative of Philip Murray, will please arise during the coming week and tell this House, if and when this strike is called and a hundred thousand or more men are out of jobs, who is going to give them employment?

Will Sidney Hillman, Thomas, Frankenstein, or Murray give any one of the hundred thousand or more a job? Or is the United States to step in when the unemployment payments have been exhausted and maintain them in idleness?

Any meddlesome boy or individual can take the family timepiece apart, but not all of those who do it can put it together again.

Now, if some of the gentlemen here who are always, figuratively speaking, damning all employers, all the creators and maintainers of jobs, all those who meet pay rolls, will just get up on their feet and answer that question, it may be of great help to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, some of the members of which

are now trying to write a bill calling for the expenditure of some \$24,000,000,000 to create jobs for some 8,000,000 anticipated unemployed workers.

Those named above are able to close down industry, to throw men out of jobs. Did any of you ever hear of any one of them creating a job, giving employment?

HOUSE PERIODICAL PRESS GALLERY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law compensation at the rate of \$2,700 per annum, payable monthly, for the services of a superintendent of the House Periodical Press Gallery—

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the resolution temporarily.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. There is nothing before the House. The gentleman has withdrawn the resolution, which is his right.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—HEALTH LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my message to the Congress of September 6, 1945, there were enumerated in a proposed economic bill of rights certain rights which ought to be assured to every American citizen.

One of them was: "The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health." Another was the "right to adequate protection from the economic fears of * * * sickness * * *."

Millions of our citizens do not now have a full measure of opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health. Millions do not now have protection or security against the economic effects of sickness. The time has arrived for action to help them attain that opportunity and that protection.

The people of the United States received a shock when the medical examinations conducted by the Selective Service System revealed the widespread physical and mental incapacity among the young people of our Nation. We had had prior warnings from eminent medical authorities and from investigating committees. The statistics of the last war had shown the same condition. But the Selective Service System has brought it forcibly to our attention recently—in terms which all of us can understand.

As of April 1, 1945, nearly 5,000,000 male registrants between the ages of 18 and 37 had been examined and classified as unfit for military service. The number of those rejected for military service

was about 30 percent of all those examined. The percentage of rejection was lower in the younger age groups and higher in the higher age groups, reaching as high as 49 percent for registrants between the ages of 34 and 37.

In addition, after actual induction, about a million and a half men had to be discharged from the Army and Navy for physical or mental disability, exclusive of wounds; and an equal number had to be treated in the armed forces for diseases or defects which existed before induction.

Among the young women who applied for admission to the Women's Army Corps there was similar disability. Over one-third of those examined were rejected for physical or mental reasons.

These men and women who were rejected for military service are not necessarily incapable of civilian work. It is plain, however, that they have illnesses and defects that handicap them, reduce their working capacity, or shorten their lives.

It is not so important to search the past in order to fix the blame for these conditions. It is more important to resolve now that no American child shall come to adult life with diseases or defects which can be prevented or corrected at an early age.

Medicine has made great strides in this generation—especially during the last 4 years. We owe much to the skill and devotion of the medical profession. In spite of great scientific progress, however, each year we lose many more persons from preventable and premature deaths than we lost in battle or from war injuries during the entire war.

We are proud of past reductions in our death rates. But these reductions have come principally from public-health and other community services. We have been less effective in making available to all of our people the benefits of medical progress in the care and treatment of individuals.

In the past, the benefits of modern medical science have not been enjoyed by our citizens with any degree of equality. Nor are they today. Nor will they be in the future—unless Government is bold enough to do something about it.

People with low or moderate incomes do not get the same medical attention as those with high incomes. The poor have more sickness, but they get less medical care. People who live in rural areas do not get the same amount or quality of medical attention as those who live in our cities.

Our new economic bill of rights should mean health security for all, regardless of residence, station, or race—everywhere in the United States.

We should resolve now that the health of this Nation is a national concern; that financial barriers in the way of attaining health shall be removed; that the health of all its citizens deserves the help of all the Nation.

There are five basic problems which we must attack vigorously if we would reach the health objectives of our economic bill of rights.

1. The first has to do with the number and distribution of doctors and hospitals. One of the most important requirements

for adequate health service is professional personnel—doctors, dentists, public health and hospital administrators, nurses, and other experts.

The United States has been fortunate with respect to physicians. In proportion to population it has more than any large country in the world, and they are well trained for their calling. It is not enough, however, that we have them in sufficient numbers. They should be located where their services are needed. In this respect we are not so fortunate.

The distribution of physicians in the United States has been grossly uneven and unsatisfactory. Some communities have had enough or even too many; others have had too few. Year by year the number in our rural areas has been diminishing. Indeed, in 1940, there were 31 counties in the United States, each with more than a thousand inhabitants, in which there was not a single practicing physician. The situation with respect to dentists was even worse.

One important reason for this disparity is that in some communities there are no adequate facilities for the practice of medicine. Another reason—closely allied with the first—is that the earning capacity of the people in some communities makes it difficult if not impossible for doctors who practice there to make a living.

The demobilization of 60,000 doctors, and of the tens of thousands of other professional personnel in the armed forces, is now proceeding on a large scale. Unfortunately, unless we act rapidly, we may expect to see them concentrate in the places with greater financial resources and avoid other places, making the inequalities even greater than before the war.

Demobilized doctors cannot be assigned. They must be attracted. In order to be attracted, they must be able to see ahead of them professional opportunities and economic assurances.

Inequalities in the distribution of medical personnel are matched by inequalities in hospitals and other health facilities. Moreover, there are just too few hospitals, clinics and health centers to take proper care of the people of the United States.

About 1,200 counties, 40 percent of the total in the country, with some 15,000,000 people, have either no local hospital, or none that meets even the minimum standards of national professional associations.

The deficiencies are especially severe in rural and semi-rural areas and in those cities where changes in population have placed great strains on community facilities.

I want to emphasize, however, that the basic problem in this field cannot be solved merely by building facilities. They have to be staffed; and the communities have to be able to pay for the services. Otherwise the new facilities will be little used.

2. The second basic problem is the need for development of public health services and maternal and child care. The Congress can be justifiably proud of its share in making recent accomplishments possible: Public-health and

maternal and child-health programs already have made important contributions to national health. But large needs remain. Great areas of our country are still without these services. This is especially true among our rural areas; but it is true also in far too many urban communities.

Although local public-health departments are now maintained by some 18,000 counties and other local units, many of these have only skeleton organizations, and approximately 40,000,000 citizens of the United States still live in communities lacking full-time local public-health service. At the recent rate of progress in developing such service, it would take more than a hundred years to cover the whole Nation.

If we agree that the national health must be improved, our cities, towns, and farming communities must be made healthful places in which to live through provision of safe water systems, sewage-disposal plants and sanitary facilities. Our streams and rivers must be safeguarded against pollution. In addition to building a sanitary environment for ourselves and for our children, we must provide those services which prevent disease and promote health.

Services for expectant mothers and for infants, care of crippled or otherwise physically handicapped children, and inoculation for the prevention of communicable diseases are accepted public-health functions. So, too, are many kinds of personal services such as the diagnosis and treatment of widespread infections like tuberculosis and venereal disease. A large part of the population today lacks many or all of these services.

Our success in the traditional public-health sphere is made plain by the conquest over many communicable diseases. Typhoid fever, smallpox, and diphtheria—diseases for which there are effective controls—have become comparatively rare. We must make the same gains in reducing our maternal and infant mortality, in controlling tuberculosis, venereal disease, malaria, and other major threats to life and health. We are only beginning to realize our potentialities in achieving physical well-being for all our people.

3. The third basic problem concerns medical research and professional education.

We have long recognized that we cannot be content with what is already known about health or disease. We must learn and understand more about health and how to prevent and cure disease.

Research—well directed and continuously supported—can do much to develop ways to reduce those diseases of body and mind which now cause most sickness, disability, and premature death—diseases of the heart, kidneys, and arteries, rheumatism, cancer, diseases of childbirth, infancy, and childhood, respiratory diseases, and tuberculosis. And research can do much toward teaching us how to keep well and how to prolong healthy human life.

Cancer is among the leading causes of death. It is responsible for over 160,000 recorded deaths a year, and should receive special attention. Though we

already have the National Cancer Institute of the Public Health Service, we need still more coordinated research on the cause, prevention, and cure of this disease. We need more financial support for research and to establish special clinics and hospitals for diagnosis and treatment of the disease especially in its early stages. We need to train more physicians for the highly specialized services so essential for effective control of cancer.

There is also special need for research on mental diseases and abnormalities. We have done pitifully little about mental illnesses. Accurate statistics are lacking, but there is no doubt that there are at least 2,000,000 persons in the United States who are mentally ill, and that as many as 10,000,000 will probably need hospitalization for mental illnesses for some period in the course of their lifetime. A great many of these persons would be helped by proper care. Mental cases occupy more than one-half of the hospital beds, at a cost of about \$500,000,000 per year—practically all of it coming out of taxpayers' money. Each year there are 125,000 new mental cases admitted to institutions. We need more mental-disease hospitals, more outpatient clinics. We need more services for early diagnosis, and especially we need much more research to learn how to prevent mental break-down. Also, we must have many more trained and qualified doctors in this field.

It is clear that we have not done enough in peacetime for medical research and education in view of our enormous resources and our national interest in health progress. The money invested in research pays enormous dividends. If anyone doubts this, let him think of penicillin, plasma, DDT powder, and new rehabilitation techniques.

4. The fourth problem has to do with the high cost of individual medical care. The principal reason why people do not receive the care they need is that they cannot afford to pay for it on an individual basis at the time they need it. This is true not only for needy persons. It is also true for a large proportion of normally self-supporting persons.

In the aggregate, all health services—from public-health agencies, physicians, hospitals, dentists, nurses, and laboratories—absorb only about 4 percent of the national income. We can afford to spend more for health.

But 4 percent is only an average. It is cold comfort in individual cases. Individual families pay their individual costs, and not average costs. They may be hit by sickness that calls for many times the average cost—in extreme cases for more than their annual income. When this happens they may come face to face with economic disaster. Many families, fearful of expense, delay calling the doctor long beyond the time when medical care would do the most good.

For some persons with very low income or no income at all we now use taxpayers' money in the form of free services, free clinics, and public hospitals. Tax-supported, free medical care for needy persons, however, is insufficient in most of our cities and in nearly all of our rural

areas. This deficiency cannot be met by private charity or the kindness of individual physicians.

Each of us knows doctors who work through endless days and nights, never expecting to be paid for their services because many of their patients are unable to pay. Often the physician spends not only his time and effort, but even part of the fees he has collected from patients able to pay, in order to buy medical supplies for those who cannot afford them. I am sure that there are thousands of such physicians throughout our country. They cannot, and should not, be expected to carry so heavy a load.

5. The fifth problem has to do with loss of earnings when sickness strikes. Sickness not only brings doctor bills, it also cuts off income.

On an average day, there are about seven million persons so disabled by sickness or injury that they cannot go about their usual tasks. Of these, about three and a quarter millions are persons who, if they were not disabled, would be working or seeking employment. More than one-half of these disabled workers have already been disabled for 6 months; many of them will continue to be disabled for years, and some for the remainder of their lives.

Every year, four or five hundred million working days are lost from productive employment because of illness and accident among those working or looking for work—about forty times the number of days lost because of strikes on the average during the 10 years before the war. About nine-tenths of this enormous loss is due to illness and accident that is not directly connected with employment, and is therefore not covered by workmen's compensation laws.

These then are the five important problems which must be solved, if we hope to attain our objective of adequate medical care, good health, and protection from the economic fears of sickness and disability.

To meet these problems, I recommend that the Congress adopt a comprehensive and modern health program for the Nation, consisting of five major parts—each of which contributes to all the others.

FIRST. CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITALS AND RELATED FACILITIES

The Federal Government should provide financial and other assistance for the construction of needed hospitals, health centers, and other medical, health, and rehabilitation facilities. With the help of Federal funds, it should be possible to meet deficiencies in hospital and health facilities so that modern services—for both prevention and cure—can be accessible to all the people. Federal financial aid should be available not only to build new facilities where needed, but also to enlarge or modernize those we now have.

In carrying out this program, there should be a clear division of responsibilities between the States and the Federal Government. The States, localities, and the Federal Government should share in the financial responsibilities. The Federal Government should not construct or operate these hospitals. It should, how-

ever, lay down minimum national standards for construction and operation, and should make sure that Federal funds are allocated to those areas and projects where Federal aid is needed most. In approving State plans and individual projects, and in fixing the national standards, the Federal agency should have the help of a strictly advisory body that includes both public and professional members.

Adequate emphasis should be given to facilities that are particularly useful for prevention of disease, mental as well as physical, and to the coordination of various kinds of facilities. It should be possible to go a long way toward knitting together facilities for prevention with facilities for cure, the large hospitals of medical centers with the smaller institutions of surrounding areas, the facilities for the civilian population with the facilities for veterans.

The general policy of Federal-State partnership which has done so much to provide the magnificent highways of the United States can be adapted to the construction of hospitals in the communities which need them.

SECOND, EXPANSION OF PUBLIC-HEALTH, MATERNAL AND CHILD-HEALTH SERVICES

Our programs for public-health and related services should be enlarged and strengthened. The present Federal-State cooperative health programs deal with general public-health work, tuberculosis, and venereal disease control, maternal and child-health services, and services for crippled children.

These programs were especially developed in the 10 years before the war, and have been extended in some areas during the war. They have already made important contributions to national health, but they have not yet reached a large proportion of our rural areas, and, in many cities, they are only partially developed.

No area in the Nation should continue to be without the services of a full-time health officer and other essential personnel. No area should be without essential public-health services or sanitation facilities. No area should be without community-health services such as maternal and child-health care.

Hospitals, clinics, and health centers must be built to meet the needs of the total population, and must make adequate provision for the safe birth of every baby, and for the health protection of infants and children.

Present laws relating to general public health, and to maternal and child health, have built a solid foundation of Federal cooperation with the States in administering community-health services. The emergency maternity and infant-care program for the wives and infants of servicemen—a great wartime service authorized by the Congress—has materially increased the experience of every State health agency, and has provided much needed care. So, too, have other wartime programs such as venereal-disease control, industrial hygiene, malaria control, tuberculosis control, and other services offered in war essential communities.

The Federal Government should cooperate by more generous grants to the States than are provided under present laws for public-health services and for maternal and child-health care. The program should continue to be partly financed by the States themselves, and should be administered by the States. Federal grants should be in proportion to State and local expenditures, and should also vary in accordance with the financial ability of the respective States.

The health of American children, like their education, should be recognized as a definite public responsibility.

In the conquest of many diseases prevention is even more important than cure. A well-rounded national health program should, therefore, include systematic and widespread health and physical education and examinations, beginning with the youngest children and extending into community organizations. Medical and dental examinations of school children are now inadequate. A preventive health program, to be successful, must discover defects as early as possible. We should, therefore, see to it that our health programs are pushed most vigorously with the youngest section of the population.

Of course, Federal aid for community health services—for general public health and for mothers and children—should complement and not duplicate prepaid medical services for individuals, proposed by the fourth recommendation of this message.

THIRD, MEDICAL EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

The Federal Government should undertake a broad program to strengthen professional education in medical and related fields, and to encourage and support medical research.

Professional education should be strengthened where necessary through Federal grants-in-aid to public and to nonprofit private institutions. Medical research, also, should be encouraged and supported in the Federal agencies and by grants-in-aid to public and nonprofit private agencies.

In my message to the Congress of September 6, 1945, I made various recommendations for a general Federal research program. Medical research—dealing with the broad fields of physical and mental illnesses—should be made effective in part through that general program and in part through specific provisions within the scope of a national health program.

Federal aid to promote and support research in medicine, public health, and allied fields is an essential part of a general research program to be administered by a central Federal research agency. Federal aid for medical research and education is also an essential part of any national health program, if it is to meet its responsibilities for high grade medical services and for continuing progress. Coordination of the two programs is obviously necessary to assure efficient use of Federal funds. Legislation covering medical research in a national health program should provide for such coordination.

FOURTH, PREPAYMENT OF MEDICAL COSTS

Everyone should have ready access to all necessary medical, hospital, and related services.

I recommend solving the basic problem by distributing the costs through expansion of our existing compulsory social insurance system. This is not socialized medicine.

Everyone who carries fire insurance knows how the law of averages is made to work so as to spread the risk, and to benefit the insured who actually suffers the loss. If instead of the costs of sickness being paid only by those who get sick, all the people—sick and well—were required to pay premiums into an insurance fund, the pool of funds thus created would enable all who do fall sick to be adequately served without overburdening anyone. That is the principle upon which all forms of insurance are based.

During the past 15 years, hospital insurance plans have taught many Americans this magic of averages. Voluntary health insurance plans have been expanding during recent years; but their rate of growth does not justify the belief that they will meet more than a fraction of our people's needs. Only about 3 percent or 4 percent of our population now have insurance providing comprehensive medical care.

A system of required prepayment would not only spread the costs of medical care, it would also prevent much serious disease. Since medical bills would be paid by the insurance fund, doctors would more often be consulted when the first signs of disease occur instead of when the disease has become serious. Modern hospital, specialist, and laboratory services, as needed, would also become available to all, and would improve the quality and adequacy of care. Prepayment of medical care would go a long way toward furnishing insurance against disease itself, as well as against medical bills.

Such a system of prepayment should cover medical, hospital, nursing, and laboratory services. It should also cover dental care—as fully and for as many of the population as the available professional personnel and the financial resources of the system permit.

The ability of our people to pay for adequate medical care will be increased if, while they are well, they pay regularly into a common health fund, instead of paying sporadically and unevenly when they are sick. This health fund should be built up nationally, in order to establish the broadest and most stable basis for spreading the costs of illness, and to assure adequate financial support for doctors and hospitals everywhere. If we were to rely on State-by-State action only, many years would elapse before we had any general coverage. Meanwhile health service would continue to be grossly uneven, and disease would continue to cross State boundary lines.

Medical services are personal. Therefore the Nation-wide system must be highly decentralized in administration. The local administrative unit must be the keystone of the system so as to provide for local services and adaptation to local needs and conditions. Locally as

well as nationally, policy and administration should be guided by advisory committees in which the public and the medical professions are represented.

Subject to national standards, methods and rates of paying doctors and hospitals should be adjusted locally. All such rates for doctors should be adequate, and should be appropriately adjusted upward for those who are qualified specialists.

People should remain free to choose their own physicians and hospitals. The removal of financial barriers between patient and doctor would enlarge the present freedom of choice. The legal requirement on the population to contribute involves no compulsion over the doctor's freedom to decide what services his patient needs. People will remain free to obtain and pay for medical service outside of the health-insurance system if they desire, even though they are members of the system; just as they are free to send their children to private instead of to public schools, although they must pay taxes for public schools.

Likewise physicians should remain free to accept or reject patients. They must be allowed to decide for themselves whether they wish to participate in the health-insurance system full time, part time, or not at all. A physician may have some patients who are in the system and some who are not. Physicians must be permitted to be represented through organizations of their own choosing, and to decide whether to carry on in individual practice or to join with other doctors in group practice in hospitals or in clinics.

Our voluntary hospitals and our city, county, and State general hospitals, in the same way, must be free to participate in the system to whatever extent they wish. In any case they must continue to retain their administrative independence.

Voluntary organizations which provide health services that meet reasonable standards of quality should be entitled to furnish services under the insurance system and to be reimbursed for them. Voluntary cooperative organizations concerned with paying doctors, hospitals, or others for health services, but not providing services directly, should be entitled to participate if they can contribute to the efficiency and economy of the system.

None of this is really new. The American people are the most insurance-minded people in the world. They will not be frightened off from health insurance because some people have misnamed it "socialized medicine."

I repeat—what I am recommending is not socialized medicine.

Socialized medicine means that all doctors work as employees of government. The American people want no such system. No such system is here proposed.

Under the plan I suggest, our people would continue to get medical and hospital services just as they do now—on the basis of their own voluntary decisions and choices. Our doctors and hospitals would continue to deal with disease with the same professional freedom as now. There would, however, be this all-impor-

tant difference: whether or not patients get the services they need would not depend on how much they can afford to pay at the time.

I am in favor of the broadest possible coverage for this insurance system. I believe that all persons who work for a living and their dependents should be covered under such an insurance plan. This would include wage-and-salary earners, those in business for themselves, professional persons, farmers, agricultural labor, domestic employees, Government employees, and employees of non-profit institutions and their families.

In addition, needy persons and other groups should be covered through appropriate premiums paid for them by public agencies. Increased Federal funds should also be made available by the Congress under the public assistance programs to reimburse the States for part of such premiums, as well as for direct expenditures made by the States in paying for medical services provided by doctors, hospitals, and other agencies to needy persons.

Premiums for present social-insurance benefits are calculated on the first \$3,000 of earnings in a year. It might be well to have all such premiums, including those for health, calculated on a somewhat higher amount such as \$3,600.

A broad program of prepayment for medical care would need total amounts approximately equal to 4 percent of such earnings. The people of the United States have been spending, on the average, nearly this percentage of their incomes for sickness care. How much of the total fund should come from the insurance premiums and how much from general revenues is a matter for the Congress to decide.

The plan which I have suggested would be sufficient to pay most doctors more than the best they have received in peacetime years. The payments of the doctors' bills would be guaranteed, and the doctors would be spared the annoyance and uncertainty of collecting fees from individual patients. The same assurance would apply to hospitals, dentists, and nurses for the services they render.

Federal aid in the construction of hospitals will be futile unless there is current purchasing power so that people can use these hospitals. Doctors cannot be drawn to sections which need them without some assurance that they can make a living. Only a Nation-wide spreading of sickness costs can supply such sections with sure and sufficient purchasing power to maintain enough physicians and hospitals.

We are a rich nation and can afford many things. But ill-health which can be prevented or cured is one thing we cannot afford.

FIFTH. PROTECTION AGAINST LOSS OF WAGES FROM SICKNESS AND DISABILITY

What I have discussed heretofore has been a program for improving and spreading the health services and facilities of the Nation, and providing an efficient and less burdensome system of paying for them.

But no matter what we do, sickness will of course come to many. Sickness brings with it loss of wages.

Therefore, as a fifth element of a comprehensive health program, the workers of the Nation and their families should be protected against loss of earnings because of illness. A comprehensive health program must include the payment of benefits to replace at least part of the earnings that are lost during the period of sickness and long-term disability. This protection can be readily and conveniently provided through expansion of our present social insurance system, with appropriate adjustment of premiums.

Insurance against loss of wages from sickness and disability deals with cash benefits, rather than with services. It has to be coordinated with the other cash benefits under existing social insurance systems. Such coordination should be effected when other social-security measures are reexamined. I shall bring this subject again to the attention of the Congress in a separate message on social security.

I strongly urge that the Congress give careful consideration to this program of health legislation now.

Many millions of our veterans, accustomed in the armed forces to the best of medical and hospital care, will no longer be eligible for such care as a matter of right except for their service-connected disabilities. They deserve continued adequate and comprehensive health service. And their dependents deserve it, too.

By preventing illness, by assuring access to needed community and personal health services, by promoting medical research, and by protecting our people against the loss caused by sickness, we shall strengthen our national health, our national defense, and our economic productivity. We shall increase the professional and economic opportunities of our physicians, dentists, and nurses. We shall increase the effectiveness of our hospitals and public-health agencies. We shall bring new security to our people.

We need to do this especially at this time because of the return to civilian life of many doctors, dentists, and nurses, particularly young men and women.

Appreciation of modern achievements in medicine and public health has created widespread demand that they be fully applied and universally available. By meeting that demand we shall strengthen the Nation to meet future economic and social problems; and we shall make a most important contribution toward freedom from want in our land.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 19, 1945.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RAMSPECK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Raymond Moley appearing in the Washington Star.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] has a special order for November 30. She does not desire to use the time on that day and, on her behalf, I ask unanimous consent that she may have the same time following other special orders on December 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DISCHARGE OF CERTAIN SERVICEMEN

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I am following up on the bill I introduced on the 24th of September which would compel the discharge of young men under 21 years of age, of men with a wife and one or more children, and of men over the age of 35 years.

In this connection may I say that this project was not initiated simply to get somebody out of the service. In my opinion it is well-conceived legislation; it is highly important to the Nation and to the family life of our country. If we were engaged at this time in a war, of course no one would offer a proposal to discharge or release any soldiers from the service no matter what capacity they served in; however, it appears to me as if we are forgetting that we are not at war and we are loath to offer a program and provision for the discharge of those who ought to be discharged and returned to their homes.

I know that there is involved the difficulty of transportation, but in the bill I introduced in the House I said, "As rapidly as transportation facilities will permit." But I did add to that: "In no event longer than 90 days after the effective date of this act." When I introduced the bill I knew it would never get to the floor of the House in the usual way. I was not disappointed when 30 legislative days expired and no action had been taken. I did not expect any action. I knew that it would be necessary, if the bill ever reached the floor of the House for the consideration of the membership, to have it presented by way of a petition for discharge.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here today to say anything unkind about the Army or the Navy or any of the officers or officials of either of these services, but I do suggest that the question of consideration of these men who have been taken into the service in their teen ages, taken from their schools and colleges in the midst of their efforts to obtain an education in this country, the men who have served from the 2 to 3 and 4 years in this war, separated from their wives and one or more children, is a public question, and not one of military concern particularly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the difficulty grow not out of the unwillingness of the Army or the Navy to permit these men to get out of the service, but out

of the fact that it is the policy of our Government to keep them over there? Now I notice the trouble that is being reported in the papers. In all of these countries there are little wars here, there, and all over. Does not the gentleman realize that there is an over-all policy which may require those men to stay? I am not in favor of such a policy but it occurs to me that the fault does not lie so much with the Army and the Navy as it does with those who make the policy.

Mr. FOLGER. I cannot answer the gentleman about that.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. I think perhaps there is at least a partial answer to that situation in another direction. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress informs me that on the 6th of May, when we had two wars going on, we had 1,497 generals, but on the 1st of October, after 1,500,000 men had been discharged, and both wars were over and the country was at peace, we had 1,527 generals; an increase of 30 generals. I am wondering if we can demobilize the Army without demobilizing some generals if this job is to be done effectively?

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I suggested in the beginning that I did not propose to have so much to say about the Army and the Navy, but I do suggest that we have not come to realize that we are not at war. We have not come to realize what it means to many of the men who are doing no job at all, or may be supposed to be doing patrol duty somewhere either in Japan or a portion of Germany, and that there are millions and millions of them there. The policy that is outlined in my insistence and my bill is supplemental and additional to any policy that has been or will be adopted by the Army or the Navy in the discharge of men who are not needed to perform these duties, which are quite inconsequential as compared with the needs and requirements for which they were called together in this vast number of twelve or thirteen million men.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How can the gentleman harmonize that policy of bringing all these men home with the policy of maintaining or being a part of the United Nations, where we are supposed to furnish the men to maintain peace throughout the world. You surely cannot keep them over there fighting and bring them home at the same time. We have to let go of one policy or the other.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I would have to talk a long time to answer that. In the first place, we are in a different age altogether. Overnight our whole life was changed. In that connection, may I read excerpts from a few articles which I have found in respect to this matter:

Such blasts as leveled Hiroshima and Nagasaki on August 5 and 8, 1945, never occurred on earth before, nor in the sun or stars,

which burn from sources that release their energy much more slowly than does uranium.

Then from Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, of the New York Times:

In a fraction of a second the atomic bomb that dropped on Hiroshima altered our traditional economic, political, and military values. It capped a revolution in the technique of war that forces immediate reconsideration of our entire national defense problem.

Then, Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill had something to say about this in a speech which he made, I think, before the House of Commons:

There are those who considered that the atomic bomb should never have been used at all . . . that rather than throw this bomb we should have sacrificed a million Americans and a quarter of a million British lives in the desperate battles and massacres of an invasion of Japan. Future generations will judge this dire decision, and I believe, if they find themselves in a happier world from which war has been banished and where freedom reigns, they will not condemn those who struggled for their benefit amid the horrors and miseries of this grim and ferocious epoch.

The bomb brought peace, but man alone can keep that peace.

Nothing can stay the progress of research in any country, but the construction of the immense plants necessary to transform the theory into action cannot be improvised. So far as we know, there are perhaps 3 or 4 years before the great progress in the United States can be overtaken. In these 3 years, we must remold the relationships of all men of all nations in such a way that men do not wish, or dare, to fall upon each other for the sake of vulgar, outdated ambition, or for passionate differences in ideologies, and that international bodies by supreme authority may give peace on earth and justice among men. Our pilgrimage has brought us to a sublime moment in the history of the world.

From the least to the greatest, all must strive to be worthy of these supreme opportunities. There is not an hour to be wasted; there is not a day to be lost.

Mr. Speaker, what does that mean? To my mind, it means that we must come to a full realization of the fact that it is just about as sensible to undertake to carry on war according to the methods and with the means that we employed in this last war, World War II, as it would have been to use in this World War II the rifle and the musket that were known during and prior to the War Between the States.

It is not a question of comparison, but we are going to have absolute destruction through war or we shall have no war at all. We cannot have war without total destruction of a part or all of the civilization of the world. Why, then, do we punish these young men who, willingly, many of them by voluntary action of their own, spent 2 or 3 years of the most important part of their lives, who laid their books down in the high schools and came home from the colleges and went off to war, for what? To defend this Nation against the onslaught of two of the most merciless nations of the world. Our men did not want to fight. They never have wanted to fight. They did not want to be soldiers. They did not want to lead a military life. They do not want and never did intend to make that their career upon this earth. Yet, as though they did, painfully we have heard

that they will give no consideration to the return of the school-age boys as a part of our program of the demobilization of the armed forces. We have been told that. What must we do? The only thing left for us to do, as men giving consideration to the civil requirements of the development of our young men in this country, is to seek legislation to require their return. I am again suggesting that the importance of these considerations is not best addressed to men of military bent. Their judgment, in my opinion, is not so reliable as that of the man who lives with the situation every day here at home. We have heard and we accept it as a fact that as the twig is bent, so the tree will be inclined. We have heard and accept it as fortunate sometimes, and sometimes unfortunately true that "I am a part of all I have come in contact with." For that reason, Mr. Speaker, it does not convince me that the policy of denial in the demobilization program of consideration to men who have a wife and one or more children, to boys who seek an education, as I say, I am not convinced that that policy is best for this country. It is a question that can be more wisely and safely determined by those whose lives have been devoted to educational pursuits of themselves, their children, and their neighbors' children, to those who have seen and who have observed from day to day the grief, the sorrow, and sometimes the disaster of separation of a man from his wife and his children.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Holding the views that you do about the education of the young men, how do you justify the conscription of these 18-year-olds for compulsory military training?

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I answer that by saying that I voted to conscript them, if you want to call it that, and that is not an impolite term so far as the truth is concerned. I voted for it because we were told they were necessary to the defense of this country. War was inevitable. I knew it in 1940, and the majority of the people in this country knew it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. We were attacked by those who had spent 8 or 10 years in making ready for the day when they would undertake to conquer and enslave the world. For the protection of this country those boys were sent to war. But that necessity does not now obtain, in my opinion, and will never obtain, with the means and methods of warfare now at hand.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman did not understand me or else I did not make myself clear. I was not talking about that conscription. I am talking about the bill that is now pending before the Committee on Military Affairs conscripting the young men of the future, conscripting them today.

Mr. FOLGER. The gentleman has drawn me out on something that I do not know whether I had adverted to, but

I am bound to answer by saying I am opposed to that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is making a fine appeal to get these boys back home, and I was wondering whether he was in favor of conscripting them today to send some others across.

Mr. FOLGER. No, sir. I must say I am opposed to it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina. I have a petition in the well to bring out my bill, H. R. 4125, that would permit the discharge of all men who have been continuously in the service for 18 months or more or who have dependents at home who need their attention, or who desire to return to school.

I have just received a letter from San Francisco, from a young married man in the service. Evidently they are shipping these men to Asia. General MacArthur said he would not need over 200,000 men in Japan, and I believe he said when he got things under control he could get along with 60,000. Yet, listen to this letter, written from San Francisco on November 13, 1945:

I am with a unit composed of 65 men who are shipping overseas tomorrow. About 90 percent of us are 30 or over, pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, with at least two children. What I want to know is how long does the War Department intend to keep us in the service, now that the war is over.

I contend that holding these men in the service now cannot be justified from any standpoint.

Mr. FOLGER. I thank the gentleman.

I want to read to you something that Lieutenant General Clay said with reference to the very subject which the gentleman from Mississippi was speaking about.

Gen. Lucius B. Clay, General Eisenhower's deputy, dropped in tonight for the dedication of the new enlisted men's club and was asked about the I-want-to-go-home attitude of American occupational and military Government forces. Quoting General Clay's reply: "The sooner we get rid of the 'I want to go homes' and replace them with a personnel who want to stay, the better we are off. We want people who will stay and make a career of this job. We are getting 15,000 new personnel this month."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the gentleman stated a moment ago that he knew in 1940 that war was imminent. That was about the time when President Roosevelt said: "Whoever thinks we need a two-ocean Navy is just plain dumb." Is it possible the gentleman had some information that the White House should have had back in those days? These are the days of the Pearl Harbor investigation, and probably there are some things we ought to know more about.

Mr. FOLGER. I think I understand the gentleman. This is not a political matter with me. I will observe, however, that it is quite evident that as far back as 1939, and probably even further back, the then President of the United

States realized that there was great danger of war and danger of our being drawn into it. He realized that, of course, in 1940 as did many of the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker, for what purpose are we keeping these boys and these men in the service, if you want to call it service? I noticed the other day, just Friday, I think, a statement in the press that the one millionth man had been discharged—that is "t-h", one millionth—and figuring from that, with VE-day May 8, 1945, and 1,000,000 men discharged as of the present date, I calculate that at this rate it would require about 5 years to demobilize the eight or ten million boys and men who are supposed to be sent back home.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. I believe the gentleman has been misinformed as to the number of men the Army has discharged. I believe he will find that the Army has discharged approximately 3,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. The Army, Navy, and Marine Corps together.

Mr. SHAFER. Yes. I am very much in favor of some movement to get these boys home. The gentleman may recall that it was brought out earlier on the floor today that the War Department reduced its critical score under the point system to 55 over the week end. I asked the question then: What is the use of reducing this critical score if they do not bring the boys home? Is it just to add some more sop to pacify the public? Perhaps the gentleman can answer that.

Mr. FOLGER. Answering the gentleman I may say I hardly think it is stubbornness or an attempt to deceive the people on the part of the Army and Navy, but just that they are not able to return the men as fast as we would like. They are doing the best they can. My bill would urge them to greater effort because 90 days is the limit within which they are obliged to find ships and transportation.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, my point is, of course, that these men who are being shipped overseas are very high-point men, some having as many as 95 and 100 points, some as high as even 115 points.

Mr. FOLGER. I realize that, but that is something I cannot go into. I am talking about the policy to be adopted in any program that is set up to require the discharge of men with families because they have been disrupted long enough; and those boys under '21 should be brought back home and permitted to continue their schooling. If not they will grow up in ignorance and never will have an education.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. They are being kept in service by one point; that is, a point of order against my amendment the other day.

I believe I am going to get that amendment put on in the Senate, but if I do not, when you Members get through hearing from home we will get enough signers on

one of these petitions to bring one of these measures to the floor and pass it.

But I want to ask the gentleman from North Carolina, even taking the figures used by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], 3,000,000, that still leaves about 8,000,000 in the service, does it not?

Mr. FOLGER. According to my understanding it does. What I read was probably a little boasting about the discharge of the one-millionth man, referring to the Army alone.

Mr. RANKIN. I saw the statement to which the gentleman from Michigan referred. But suppose 3,000,000 have been discharged. That still leaves us with an Army and Navy and Marine Corps of something like 8,000,000 men at a time when Douglas MacArthur tells us he will not need over 200,000 in Japan and when we have at least 3 other nations in Europe helping to police Germany. We will not need any more men in Germany than MacArthur will need in Japan.

Then why keep all these 8,000,000 men in the service when they are begging to come home, when their people want them, and when these boys are having their morale destroyed and having their opportunity to go to school taken away from them? I say it is the duty of Congress now to pass legislation of this kind and we ought to do it at once.

Mr. FOLGER. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the very fact that these two considerations are denied in the demobilization policy are the things that make it necessary for me and you to do something we do not want to do; that is, to have Congress, if we can, take hold and require that it be done.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman is making a very fine statement and I have enjoyed it very much. As chairman of the Committee on Education may I say that I have been brought in rather close contact with the educators of the country and with the college people of this Nation. The people of this country know that some of our large institutions, and I refer to colleges with a thousand or twelve hundred students, were so depleted that they only had from 60 to 80 students in the college, who were usually IV-F's or somebody taking research work. This clearly shows to me and to many others familiar with the situation that we are now experiencing about a 4½-year educational deficit in this country. If we continue this deficit then follow that up by taking the next crop of boys from high school and putting them into the Army, I am wondering where the President thinks he will get the technicians, the dentists, the doctors, the skilled professional men to carry out the program just outlined in his message read to the House a few minutes ago?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from North Carolina may I say that I have written every governor in the United States and every superintendent of public instruction and I have received favorable replies from the great majority of them. However, the superintendents of schools and the presidents of colleges say they are afraid to comment too much lest they be charged with trying to do something to aid their own cause, to fill their own colleges.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

THE LATE MRS. ROBERT CROSSER

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the house for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret that I wish to inform the Members of the House of the death of the devoted wife of our able and distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mrs. Crosser has been an exemplary mother, a constant source of inspiration during adversity and health, both to her family and to those who have sought her counsel and assistance.

To Mr. CROSSER, who has had the good fortune to enjoy the companionship of such a remarkable, cheerful, and understanding wife, we offer our deep sympathy in his sorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

DISCHARGE OF CERTAIN SERVICEMEN

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from North Carolina who spoke a minute ago that I agree with many of the things he said and I am going to speak along the same line. From the way the soldiers are being handled and their return being held up, one is almost led to the belief that the Army has moved in and taken over. At any rate, that is the way the country has begun to feel about this matter.

The fellows over there are beginning to think that Mr. Dewey was right when he charged that certain agencies here are not going to be in any hurry about getting these men home. I want to read a letter that tells you how the morale of these men is being broken down. This is a letter from a serviceman overseas to his mother:

Just a few lines to let you know I'm all right but terribly blue and homesick and depressed. It doesn't look like I'll get home until at the earliest Easter. They aren't making any attempt to get the men home from over here. This sitting around doing nothing but just waiting, waiting is driving me crazy. All the news we get here from Manila is totally disheartening. Men with 80 and 90 points are still sitting around

waiting to come home down here. There isn't any reason in the world for it.

I want to say that there is no reason for many of these soldiers being over there. I received a letter some time ago from a lieutenant who said that they were on a boat 700 miles out of the Panama Canal when they received official notice that the war was over, and that boat, instead of coming back, went on down 17,000 miles to New Guinea, where they unloaded them, then loaded them up and took them to Manila, where they still are, and when that boat sailed into the Harbor of Manila, there were 496 ships tied up in the harbor, some for 4 months. Manila was so full of personnel that there was scarcely room to sit.

Back to my letter:

Why don't you do something about such things back there. What is this? Are we just a bunch of sheep to be just herded around and kicked and mauled just as though we weren't fit to lick the earth even. We're human beings. We want to come home to our loved ones. We don't want to sit over here until we rot. Yes, I'm talking to you like this. If there is anything going to be done about it, it will have to be the civilians back there to do it. Isn't our country supposed to be a democracy? Well, I have been told it was, but ever since I've been in the Army I have begun to doubt it more and more. Yes, they write this and that in the papers, about getting so many men home already. It is all a bunch of lies. They are discharging the men in the States to make it look like the men are getting back from overseas. Believe me, if the people of the United States don't soon open their eyes, they are going to have a revolution on their hands. Yes; you all can sit back there in nice soft arm chairs, drink cold drinks in the summer and live a lovely life while we sit over here and sweat our lives away. It's a wonderful world, isn't it. Sure, I've got a lot to look forward to. Will I get to enjoy it when I'm young and able to enjoy life or must I wait until I'm too old to enjoy it. It all is up to you mothers and fathers as to the answer to that. I'm pretty even tempered and very hard to get aroused, but I'm aroused now and mad enough to fight to get home. Here's a little story you might like to hear. It seems that a captain of a ship here went into Manila to the transportation authorities and said: "Colonel, I have a ship going back to the States empty on which I can take at least 500 men with me," and the colonel looked at him and told him to get the hell out of there, that he was running this show. If I were back there I'd sure see what the reason was, why these men aren't being returned from overseas to their homes. Yes, I can hear you now saying, "The very idea of a son of mine talking to me like that." Well, how else am I going to make you see the facts? I've been telling you all along how things were, but you didn't believe me. Well, what do you say. How about some action back there? There isn't a single reason in the world why they couldn't have every man home by the first of the year.

Yes, you say trust in the Lord; He'll see you through. Well it isn't the Lord who is keeping me over here. It is that damn War Department. My work is done here, so what are they going to do with me? Ha! They are going to assign me to another outfit and probably send me to Japan. Yes, when all the men in the United States with 2 years service in the Army are being discharged, and here I am with over 3 years and going up to Japan probably. Yes, we sure do have a wonderful Government; don't we? We are supposed to have freedom of speech. Well

why don't you mothers and fathers and wives and relations speak your piece and get that Government back to earth. Yes; I'm not the only one like this. Every last one of us over here are completely fed up. Unless something is done back there soon there is bound to be one awful explosion before long. I'm on orders now to be shipped out of here for where no one knows, but we all know it won't be back to the States. I made a prediction before I came overseas that I'd be home for Christmas '46, and by the looks of things I'm sure not going to be far wrong. The officer in charge of the sanitation department issued a statement the other day to the effect that Liberty ships could be fixed up in 48 hours to transport about 750 troops back to the States on each one. Now the generals here are trying to have him thrown out for that. They claim it isn't sanitary enough to move troops on them, yet thousands of troops came over here on them, and they have been used to transport troops back and forth over here. One of them was good enough to bring about 500 men up here to the Philippines, and I was one of them, and so I can't see why they can't be used to get us home. I don't think I should be the first to come home by any means, but then, too, I can't see why they can't get every man back in the States by the first of the year. Lack of shipping space. Ha! What a poor excuse. I'll bet you there are at least 1,500 ships lying out here in the Pacific in harbors, idle and empty, and not doing a thing, and yet they tell you and me there is a lack of shipping space. All I've got to say is if you were here in my place you'd sure feel the same way I do. Now I don't want to hear a word from you about trying to be patient. I'll blow up sky high then. I'm using all the will power and self-control I've got right now to hold onto myself. There isn't a damn thing to do here, and besides it is entirely too hot even if you wanted to do something. Yesterday I tried playing horseshoes to do something to keep from going crazy. It helped a little, but I played two games and then I was tired of that. There is only one thing in my mind right now, and that is home, home, home. I can't relax and be patient. Gosh, I do want to come home, with all my heart and soul.

We have closed up shop here. I haven't worked for the last 2 days. We moved everything out on last Friday, so all I do is be around and read and try to keep my mind occupied. Oh, please, please, mother, do something back there to get me home to the States.

Well, I guess after you read this letter you'll not want to have anything to do with me any more, and I guess I can't blame you, but there are my feelings to a "t." Well, must close for now and go eat. Hope to hear from you soon, and let's write Congress every day if necessary to get a little action and get us home.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I gather from what the gentleman read there that that young man is a little out of patience with the War Department and the Navy. What does the gentleman think is going to happen to the Congressmen when that fellow gets home and finds out that we have not been doing anything about that 6-month clause that said he was entitled to be discharged 6 months after the fighting was over.

Mr. GROSS. Here is the answer to that in another letter: "No boats, no votes."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now he is talking business.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The man that wrote that letter appealed to the mothers and fathers to let their Congressmen hear from them. In addition to the flood of mail I am getting, within the last 2 days I have received 100 telegrams from the mothers and the wives of soldiers in Pennsylvania alone, and I received about 75 from Ohio today, appealing to me to get my bill passed to get these men out.

Mr. GROSS. I have another letter here signed by 11 veterans over in Manila. I will read just a couple of paragraphs of this letter and insert it as a part of my remarks:

It seems to me that hardly any effort at all is being made. I am beginning to wonder, Do they really want us back? As Mauldin put it so effectively, "There didn't seem to be any delay getting us over here. And since when has the War Department begun getting solicitous about our comfort?"

We have been told through various agencies that the fire hazard is too great for us to ride on LST's, making our beds of the same wooden cots that we are using at the present. It is too long and tedious a journey to be made in such a manner. That was told to us with a perfectly straight face, to us and thousands like us, all of whom made at least two amphibious assault landings (under fire) from these very same ships. The very same cots, for that matter, placed on top of 50-gallon drums of 80-octane gasoline and flame-thrower fuel.

Now, they say they cannot bring these men home in those ships, even when they do not have all of the above hazards on board.

There were enclosed with this letter a number of newspaper clippings from a Manila paper, Daily Pacifican. I will comment on this clipping briefly and include it as part of my remarks. It says:

Ships can carry 1,500 men, yet may return empty.

A ship capable of carrying 1,500 returnees to the States stands a good chance of leaving for the west coast with only a ballast load, unless various Army and civilian agencies get together within the next few days.

You notice this says, "unless various agencies get together."

The snarled situation came to light when officers and crew members of the steamship *Marguerite Le Hand*, a large C-3 cargo vessel now at pier 5 here, told yesterday how they had tried without success to interest Army authorities in using their vessel as a troopship.

The ship has fresh-water tanks sufficient to hold 500 tons of water. It has ventilated holds. It has ample large refrigerator units now in operation.

In addition, the crewmen said, the *Le Hand* is equipped with its own evaporators capable of producing about 20 tons of fresh water a day.

When an effort was made to find the reasons underlying the Army's alleged lack of interest, conflicting statements came from all sides.

Col. R. B. Lincoln, of the plans and requisitions section of AFWESPAC Transportation Corps, told a Pacifican reporter that it was not feasible to use ships like the *Le Hand* because they have an insufficient water-carrying capacity. Colonel Lincoln also stated that the departure of the vessel from San Francisco, if it did sail from here as a troop-

ship, would be delayed about 3 days while the makeshift accommodations were ripped out and the vessel disinfected.

In addition, Colonel Lincoln stated that it would be necessary to obtain permission of the War Shipping Administration before the *Le Hand* could be used to carry troops.

When asked about this latter statement, R. A. MacDonell, acting regional director of the War Shipping Administration here, declared "The WSA has never turned the Army down on a request for ships."

While MacDonell failed to state whether his office had been asked for the necessary permission to convert the *Le Hand*, he did say that AFWESPAC Transportation officials had radioed the War Department yesterday morning for War Department permission to use the vessel. Colonel Lincoln also said that a communication had been sent to Washington.

MacDonell estimated that it would take 4 or 5 days for the War Department reply to reach officials here.

Commenting on this, one of the *Le Hand*'s officers stated that while a sailing date has not been set for his ship, "It might leave before the permission is received from Washington."

Answering objections that the *Le Hand* was not suitable for troopship conversion, crew members stated flatly that they could carry about 1,500 troops under "fairly comfortable" conditions. The ship has fresh-water tanks sufficient to hold 500 tons of water. It has ventilated holds. It has ample large refrigerator units now in operation.

In addition, the crewmen said, the *Le Hand* is equipped with its own evaporators capable of producing about 20 tons of fresh water a day.

Meanwhile, the *Le Hand* is slated to return to the States in ballast unless orders are changed beforehand.

A ship's officer estimates that about 20 days at the most will be required to complete the Manila-San Francisco voyage.

A veteran writes to me as follows:

During the time of war there was no consideration for the comfort and safety of the enlisted personnel who traveled in vermin-infested Liberty and Victory ships with latrines set upon the deck next to mess halls. There was no consideration for the men who chose to sleep in the downpouring rain to avoid the open holds with their lack of ventilation, where bunks were arranged five high, 2 feet between bunks.

Yet they say, "Too unsanitary," and all that.

I have another letter from Manila. I am getting dozens of them each day. This letter ends up by saying to the Congress, "No boats, no votes." Make up your minds—those fellows mean it. I am not a bit afraid of them so far as the "no boats, no votes" is concerned. This is not a vote-getting proposition with me. I have three of my own in the Army and have a definite interest in the other fellow's boy and girl over there, as well as the fathers of the million lonesome children at this end. It is a fact that over in north Africa, Germany, Indochina, and in the Aleutians there are certain groups of nurses and soldiers who have become detached. They are just like refugees. They have nobody to go to and nobody to look to. There is a group of them in Iceland. This thing has gotten to a point where not only are those fellows blowing up but the people here are, too. It is just because the Army has moved in and with it is coming compulsory military training unless we stop them and stop them real soon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on Friday next for 30 minutes, after the reading of the Journal, the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPARKMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include certain excerpts.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and to include therein some editorials.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 391. An act to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 1591. An act to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy, and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, from among the sons of persons who have been or shall hereafter be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor;

H. R. 1868. An act authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2525. An act to include stepparents, parents by adoption, and any person who has stood in loco parentis among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 391. An act to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 1591. An act to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy, and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, from among the sons of persons who have been or shall hereafter be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor;

H. R. 1868. An act authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2525. An act to include stepparents, parents by adoption, and any person who has stood in loco parentis among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 20, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Post Office and Post Roads Committee will hold a hearing Tuesday, November 20, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., on H. R. 2647, a bill to restore the 2-cent postage on first-class mail for local delivery, and H. R. 4652, concerning substitutes in the postal service, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Brand Names and Newsprint Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Tuesday, November 20, 1945. Business to be considered: Hearings on nylon hosiery.

There will be a meeting of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Monday, November 26, 1945. Business to be considered: To begin hearings on H. R. 2764, freight forwarders' legislation.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will continue its consideration of H. R. 2346 and other related bills regarding benefits to merchant seamen on Thursday, November 29, 1945, at 10 a. m., in open hearings.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

833. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, to provide eligibility for annuity at age 70 after at least 5 years of service in lieu of 15 years of such service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

834. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy and Marine Corps shore activities; to the Committee on Claims.

835. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 4717. A bill to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; with amendments (Rept. No. 1238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary submits a minority report and views on H. R. 2788, part II (Rept. No. 1141). Referred

to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. S. 865. An act for the relief of the estate of Agnes J. Allberry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1122. An act for the relief of Charles Bryan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 215. A bill for the relief of Virginia Packard; without amendment (Rept. No. 1241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 915. A bill for the relief of Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 919. A bill for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer; with amendment (Rept. No. 1243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 948. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1244). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1073. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Verbar; with amendment (Rept. No. 1245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1251. A bill for the relief of the Irvine Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1477. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. W. McMurray, R. T. Latham, G. B. Cooper, L. W. Pearson, and Billups Oil Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1879. A bill for the relief of Rev. Neal Dewese, Mrs. Minnie Dewese, Raymond Dewese, Ralph Demert, and the estate of Lon Thurman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1248). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1918. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Parkinson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2167. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Orvis Welch; with amendments (Rept. No. 1250). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2168. A bill for the relief of Charles Zucker; with amendment (Rept. No. 1251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2270. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Westover; without amendment (Rept. No. 1252).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2670. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Kathleen Lawton McGuire; with amendment (Rept. No. 1253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2854. A bill for the relief of B. H. Spann; with amendments (Rept. 1254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2901. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Janet McKilip; with amendment (Rept. No. 1255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2974. A bill for the relief of the estate of Bobby Messick; with amendment (Rept. No. 1256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3012. A bill for the relief of George W. Murrell and Kirby Murrell, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 1257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3052. A bill for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague; without amendment (Rept. No. 1258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3454. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of William Clyde McKinney, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 1259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3554. A bill for the relief of Fred C. Litter; with amendment (Rept. No. 1260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3641. A bill for the relief of M. Martin Turpanjian; with amendment (Rept. No. 1261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3677. A bill for the relief of J. Tom Stephenson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3725. A bill for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich; without amendment (Rept. No. 1263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2769. A bill for the relief of C. Frank James; with amendments (Rept. No. 1264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3791. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Mersman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3808. A bill for the relief of the estate of William N. Theriault and Millicent Theriault; without amendment (Rept. No. 1266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4269. A bill for the relief of Ida Barger, Hazel A. Beecher, Etta Clark, Jesse Ruth France, John W. Nolan, Anna Palubicki, and Frank J. Schrom; without amendment (Rept. No. 1267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HINSHAW: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Senate Joint Resolution 51. Joint resolution granting permission to Charles Rex Marchant, Lorne E. Sasseen, and Jack Veniss Bassett to accept certain medals tendered them by the Government of Canada in the name of His Britannic Majesty, King George VI; without amendment (Rept. No. 1268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 4729. A bill directing the War and Navy Departments to forthwith discharge from the military and naval forces of the United States all enlisted military personnel who have amassed via the point system of the Army a total of 35 points or more and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4730. A bill to provide for a national health program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4731. A bill to authorize the Alaska Railroad to engage in the business of operating oceangoing vessels; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. D'ALESSANDRO:

H. R. 4732. A bill to designate September 14 as a day on which the flag is to be displayed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 4733. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural or educational programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 4734. A bill to decrease the rate of postage on air mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 4735. A bill to provide for a United States air-mail postal card and to authorize the transmission by air mail of private mailing cards (post cards); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4736. A bill to grant to enlisted personnel 30 days' leave immediately preceding their discharge from, or release from active duty in, the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 4737. A bill to prevent control of broadcasting by coercive practices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4738. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration general medical-surgical hospital facility in or near the city of Ukiah, Mendocino County, Calif.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 4739. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration general medical-surgical hospital facility in Humboldt County, Calif.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 4740. A bill for the acquisition and maintenance of wildlife management and control areas in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4741. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration general medical-surgical hospital facility at Paradise, Butte County, Calif.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. R. 4742. A bill establishing a special housing bureau in the Veterans' Administration to act in relation to the procurement of homes or farms for war veterans, and to liberalize loan conditions pertaining thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 4743. A bill to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain accumulated leave benefits; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4744. A bill relating to the clothing and equipment allowances of individuals upon discharge from the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 4745. A bill to make railroad companies responsible in damages to passengers for injuries suffered by reason of drinking conditions on trains; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4746. A bill relating to the care and treatment of seamen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 4747. A bill providing for the payment of direct Federal old-age assistance to citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 4748. A bill to authorize the State of Tennessee to convey a railroad right-of-way through Montgomery Bell Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 4749. A bill to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American soldier who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 401. A resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4717, a bill to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 4750. A bill for the relief of C. C. Vest; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H. R. 4751. A bill for the relief of Elbert C. Altman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 4752. A bill for the relief of J. G. Sullivan; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4753. A bill for the relief of Wesley P. Stephens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LeCOMPTE:

H. R. 4754. A bill with respect to national service life insurance in the case of the late Robert P. Marshall; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 4755. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the East Division of the Eastern Judicial District of Missouri to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of A. Eugene Maynor, his heirs or personal representatives, against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4756. A bill relating to the naturalization of Giovanni Schillaci, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4757. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gussie Feldman; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

1333. Mr. WELCH presented Resolution No. 5031 passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco on October 22, 1945, petitioning Congress and

urging the enactment of such legislation as will provide for the relief of all those citizens who are entitled to such relief, but who because of lack of residential qualifications are unable to qualify for indigent aid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of our salvation, to Thee we lift our hearts in prayer, bringing nothing but our need and the adoration of our contrite spirits. From Thy hands we have received the gift of life, the blessings of home and of friendship, and the sacrament of beauty; in the fullness of Thy mercy Thou hast given us work to do and the strength wherewith to do it.

Make Thou our consecration a channel for the healing stream of Thy grace, so that having been sustained by Thy patience we may be patient, having freely received Thy bounty we may be bountiful, and having been blessed by Thy love without measure we may obey Thy behest, in an earth which is now one neighborhood, to love our neighbor as ourself. Through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HATCH, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, November 19, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MANASCO, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. HOFFMAN, and Mr. BENDER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Brewster	Butler
Barkley	Buck	Capper
Bilbo	Bushfield	Carville

Chavez	Knowland	Saltonstall
Connally	La Follette	Shipstead
Cordon	Lucas	Smith
Donnell	McCarran	Stewart
Downey	McClellan	Taft
Eastland	McFarland	Taylor
Ellender	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Maybank	Tobey
Fulbright	Mead	Tunnell
George	Mitchell	Tydings
Gerry	Moore	Wagner
Green	Morse	Walsh
Guffey	Murdock	Wheeler
Gurney	Myers	Wherry
Hatch	O'Daniel	White
Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Hill	Radcliffe	Willis
Hoey	Reed	Wilson
Huffman	Revercomb	Young
Johnson, S. C.	Robertson	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is a delegate to the American Legion convention in Chicago, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is attending the conference in London to consider the creation of an educational and cultural organization of the United Nations.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business with the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] have been excused. They are members of the Atomic Energy Committee, which is on an inspection trip to Oak Ridge, Tenn.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are detained at a meeting of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are members of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator Thomas of Idaho.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unavoidably absent because of injuries resulting from an accident.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused and is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND MARKETING OF WOOL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] a member of the Special Committee to Investigate the Production, Transportation, and Marketing of Wool, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. John Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Idaho.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

STATISTICS OF THE GRADE AND STAPLE LENGTH OF COTTON

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ADDITIONAL CLAIM FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY VESSELS OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, an additional claim for damage by collision between the barge *Annapolis* and the U. S. S. *Moray*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITION RELATING TO TOLL-FREE PRIVILEGES ON SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND (CALIF.) BAY BRIDGE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from C. H. Purcell, director of public works of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif., transmitting a resolution adopted by the California Toll Bridge Authority, relating to clarification and restriction of toll-free privileges for Government traffic using the San Francisco-Oakland (Calif.) Bay Bridge, which, with the accompanying resolution, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PEACETIME COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING—LETTER FROM CAUTIOUS A. CHOATE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a letter from Cautious A. Choate, executive secretary, Central Kansas Conference of the Methodist Church, Wichita, Kans., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing for peacetime compulsory military training.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CENTRAL KANSAS
CONFERENCE BOARD OF EDUCATION,
THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Wichita, Kans., November 12, 1945.
The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Ninety thousand Methodist people of central and western Kansas do not want universal peacetime conscription of their young men.

I represent the Central Kansas Conference of the Methodist Church and my work takes me over the western two-thirds of the State. On every hand I hear expressed a great fear that universal military peacetime training will be fastened upon America at this time. There is a common feeling that this would